

# The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XIX

MARCH, 1954

NUMBER 3

## THE NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF OUR FREEDOMS

HOMER P. RAINEY\*

When a society faces a crisis one of the first things it does is to make an evaluation of its fundamental institutions. Some reason or explanation is sought for the crisis, and an attempt is made to discover what weaknesses or flaws existing in the operation of the institutions have produced the current difficulties. An understanding of the nature of the crisis is essential before the proper corrective measures can be applied.

No one can doubt that for the last thirty-five years our society has been facing a major crisis. Historians are already pointing out the fact that the last generation has been the most revolutionary period in the history of the world. The simple fact that in the last fifty years more people have been killed in war than in the previous 800 years is abundant evidence that the times are terribly out of joint.

The crisis through which our society is passing is confronting us with some difficult fundamental issues.

First, the necessity of preserving peace in the world, and second, the necessity of preserving our basic human freedoms. This paper will consider the second problem.

One of the basic issues in the current conflict is the battle between communism or totalitarianism against freedom and democracy. This conflict is so intense that, in order to prevent the spread of communism and to preserve democracy and our freedoms, all of our intelligence, ingenuity, and resources are being taxed to the limit. Communism is such a dangerous threat to the institutions of freedom and democracy that we must find effective means to protect ourselves against it. One of the reasons for the difficulty of the problem is that the threat to our freedoms in this conflict be-

\*Formerly President of Franklin College; Bucknell University; The University of Texas; and Stephens College.

tween communism and democracy is double. The first threat is communism itself; if it should prevail, all our freedoms would be gone. The other threat lies in the possibility of losing our freedoms by the methods we employ in fighting communism. We must make sure that in our zeal to defeat communism we do not lose or sacrifice our freedoms. This danger is real — so real, in fact, that the fear of such a possibility is widespread among Americans at the present time. This fear is based upon our recent experiences with various Congressional investigating committees, government loyalty programs, loyalty oaths for teachers, and other such events of the day. Many people fear that these current methods of attack upon the problems of subversion are jeopardizing the basic freedoms of American citizens.

This danger is not new. We have faced it before in other crises in our history; in fact, it seems to be another phase of a continuing problem in American life. The issue of civil liberties has been with us from the beginning of our constitutional government. Indeed, its importance as a major issue in the establishment of the Constitution is attested by the fact that the adoption of the Constitution could not be secured without the Bill of Rights guaranteeing certain basic human freedoms and giving them preferred recognition in our supreme law.

Soon after the creation of our federal union these principles underwent a basic test in the passage of the Alien and Sedition laws, 1798, as a result of the impact of the French Revolution on American life and thought. The analogy between that period and the current one is striking. In 1798 some of the American people were alarmed over the spread of the revolutionary doctrines of the French Revolution, as some are alarmed today over the threat of the revolutionary doctrines of world communism. Considerable sentiment sympathetic to the doctrines of the French Revolution existed in the United States and a great deal of activity was carried on in this country on their behalf. The French Ambassador was leading the movement, at least supplying the propaganda for it. French refugees were entering the country in large numbers and carrying on espionage work. Tensions were high, and the threat of war with France was serious when the Alien and Sedition laws were passed. Along with the passage of these laws the government took other restrictive

measures, such as extending the period required for the granting of citizenship from five to fourteen years under the Naturalization Act of 1798.

The extent to which these laws were used for political intolerance is recorded by former Attorney General Francis Biddle in these words:

Under the provisions of the Sedition Act, the Federalists sent editors to jail for criticising the administration. One was fined for writing that he hoped the wad of the cannon fired in a presidential salute might hit President Adams on the seat of his pants; another jailed for saying the President had an 'unbounded thirst for ridiculous pomp, foolish adulation and a selfish avarice.' The prosecution of Jebediah Peck, member of the New York Legislature, was said to have been based upon his circulation of a petition asking Congress to repeal the Sedition Act.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Biddle makes the further interesting observation:

This act fortunately expired in two years by its own terms. In 1799 a committee of the House of Representatives urged its re-enactment in language very much like that we hear today, if for France we substitute Russia. 'France appears to have an organized system of conduct toward foreign nations; to bring them within the sphere, and under the domination of her influence and control—Her means are in wonderful coincidence with her ends: among these, and not the least successful, is the direction and employment of the active and versatile talents of her citizens abroad as emissaries and spies.'<sup>2</sup>

A strong protest arose over these laws, and they were partly responsible for the election of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency in 1800. As soon as Jefferson became President he pardoned the prisoners who had been convicted under these laws, and Congress repaid the fines that had been imposed. Referring in the Inaugural Address of 1801 to these laws and the fears that had been aroused by the French Revolution, Jefferson made one of his remarkable statements. As reported by Mr. Biddle it is:

'During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonized spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long last liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore.' Then he addressed himself to the seditionists, the agitators, those 'among us who wish to dissolve this union, or to change its republican form.' They should 'stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.' For were we not 'in the full tide of successful experiment—free and firm—of the strangest government on earth.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Francis Biddle, *The Fear of Freedom* (New York, 1951), 38.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, 39.

What confidence in a government that was only twenty-five years old! What irony that now, at the time of our greatest strength and power, we should have our greatest fears! No less ironical is the fact that our people are now not so alert as the Americans in 1798 to defend and maintain the liberties written into the first ten Amendments to our Constitution. Another revolutionary terror looms in the world in the form of Russian Communism, and there is great danger that we will try to meet it by the sacrificing of our basic liberties. In fact, warnings are being issued that we are threatening to do exactly that. Robert E. Cushman says, in his article, "Threats to our Freedom," (Annals-May, 1951):

The most serious threats to American Civil Liberty today stem from our nation-wide and rapidly accelerating drive against Communism and other forms of disloyalty and subversion.<sup>4</sup>

A similar threat to our liberties occurred during and following World War I when Imperial Germany was the enemy. In commenting upon this period, Professor Zechariah Chafee said:

Since the fifteenth day of June, 1917, the nation has been led on by its panic-stricken fear of adverse opinion to abandon one national tradition after another—one by one, the right of freedom of speech, the right of assembly, the right to petition, the right to protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, the right against arbitrary arrest, the right of a fair trial—the principle that guilt is personal, the principal that punishment should bear some proportion to the offense, had been sacrificed and ignored.<sup>5</sup>

According to former Attorney General Francis Biddle:

Under the law of 1917 about two thousand prosecutions were brought.—The number of federal cases actually tried before a jury totaled only a little more than two hundred, but many more were tried in the state courts, and that immediately following the Armistice, most of the sentences were promptly reviewed, and on the recommendation of the Attorney General, the President made modifications or commutations, reducing most of them.

He continues:

But the thing that strikes us about the prosecutions is that the clauses in the Act, clearly intended for military security, were used for blanket suppression of speech and had little reference to soldiers.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Robert E. Cushman, *Threats to Our Freedom*, Annals, Am. Academy of Social and Political Science, May, 1951.

<sup>5</sup>Zechariah Chafee, *Free Speech in the United States* (Harvard University Press, 1942), 272.

<sup>6</sup>Francis Biddle, 58.



On this point Professor Chafee says:

It became criminal to advocate heavier taxation instead of bond issues, to state that conscription was unconstitutional though the Supreme Court had not yet held it valid, to say that the sinking of merchant ships was legal, to urge that a referendum should have preceded our declaration of war, to say that war was contrary to the teachings of Christ. Men have been punished for criticizing the Red Cross and the Y.M.C.A., while under the Minnesota Espionage Act it had been held a crime to discourage women from knitting by the remark, 'No soldier ever sees those socks.'<sup>7</sup>

From these and other past experiences certain lessons ought to be clear to us: A definite pattern of behavior seems to have been followed in each instance. The first stage is always fear — fear of some real or imaginary threat to our national existence represented by a foreign power — France, Germany, Russia. The next step is the passage of laws to avert this threat, or to reinvigorate old laws already on the books. This procedure is always accompanied by an intensive campaign of propaganda against the evil and those who embody or represent it. Then follow arrests, prosecutions, and assessment of penalties, usually out of proportion to the crimes. Then as soon as the danger is past, a relenting occurs; prisoners are released and in many cases fines are remitted. But the significant point is that we resort to practices that violate our Constitutional rights and flout our American traditions. We try to justify these invasions of our traditional liberties by pleading a crisis or an emergency. This solution is dangerous. To declare an emergency is an easy way for a government to meet a situation, and it is like using a narcotic: each successive emergency is easier to declare and less resistance is made by the body politic. Furthermore, the procedure establishes a precedent which condones the sacrifice of our Constitutional freedoms in the face of a crisis. It should be observed that these freedoms and rights were reserved and written into our basic law to meet just such emergencies in our national life. In peace time and in normal periods when events are flowing along smoothly and tensions are at a minimum, no demand arises for restriction on freedoms. The protections of freedom were not made with such periods in mind; they were made for crises and emergencies. They were set up against ultimate hazards. We do not need protection against murder until we are threatened with murder. We purchase

---

<sup>7</sup>Zechariah Chafee, 51.

health and accident insurance for protection when ill health and misfortune overtake us. We hope that we will not be ill or have an accident, but since we want protection against these hazards, we buy it in advance. The principle is the same with our freedoms. We want them in readiness against the foes that may beset them, and we have bought them in advance by constitutional guarantee. If they are no good to us in an emergency, of what value are they?

This reasoning brings us to the true significance of the First Amendment to the Constitution and the nature of the freedoms that we cherish. This Amendment reads:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.<sup>8</sup>

We need to make a careful inquiry into the full meaning and significance of this provision in the Constitution. Why did our fathers insist upon its enactment, and what are its values to free men in a free society?

On these important points Francis Biddle says:

By passing the First Amendment in 1791 the American people made doubly sure that there should not be carried into their new government the power to punish criminally criticisms of that government, however violent. That critical and disrespectful utterance tend to create an unstable condition in society, leading to internal disorder, and that they should therefore be subjected to control, was rejected by the First Amendment in favor of the democratic values of such instability—indeed, their sheer necessity of popular government is to function.<sup>9</sup>

*Congress shall pass no Law—*

This was an affirmation of the belief not merely in individual freedom from governmental control, but of something more concrete and realistic—the value to the community of unfettered political discussion.<sup>10</sup>

The United States Supreme Court said only a few years ago:

Unless there is sufficient evidence from which a jury could infer beyond a reasonable doubt that he intended to bring about the specific consequences prohibited by the Act (of 1917), an American citizen has the right to discuss these matters either by temperate reasoning or by immoderate and vicious invective.

---

<sup>8</sup>The Constitution of the United States, First Amendment.

<sup>9</sup>Francis Biddle, 56.

<sup>10</sup>Francis Biddle, 56.

It should be noted that the United States Supreme Court made another strong pronouncement on this issue in the Civil War. It said:

The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in time of war and in peace and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times and under all circumstances. (*Italics mine.*) No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever evolved by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government.<sup>11</sup>

Such strong statements as these make evident that these freedoms rest upon fundamental principles. What are they?

One principle is that ours is a government of *limited powers*. Our founding fathers were desperately afraid of despotic and arbitrary power in the hands of hereditary monarchs; in fact, they revolted against just such power. They mistrusted unlimited governmental power, and when they had the opportunity to set up a new government their primary objective was to restrict and limit its powers to keep ultimate and final sovereignty in the hands of the people. On this point John Stuart Mill in his memorable "Essay on Liberty" says:

The aim of patriots was to set limits to the power which the ruler should be suffered to exercise over the community: *and the limitation was what was meant by liberty.* (*Italics mine.*) It was attempted in two ways. First by obtaining a recognition of certain immunities, called political liberties or rights, which it was regarded as a breach of duty in the ruler to infringe, and which if he did infringe, specific resistance, or general rebellion, was held to be justifiable. A second, and generally a later expedient, was the establishment of constitutional checks; by which the consent of the community, or a body of some sort supposed to represent its interests, was made a necessary condition to some of the important acts of the governing power.<sup>12</sup>

The issue of limited powers of government raises the basic question of ultimate or final power. Where does it reside, if not in government? Under our democratic concept of society and government, ultimate sovereignty rests in the individual citizens. We, the citizens, have the power. In order that we may exercise that power effectively we select representatives and delegate to them legal powers for the governing of the nation. We also set up subordinate agencies to do the work of governing and to each we delegate the specific powers needed to do the work; our Constitution defines and allocates these legal powers. The supreme political power is the

<sup>11</sup>Taney's Decisions in *Ex parte Merryman*, Taney (1861), 246.

<sup>12</sup>John Stuart Mill, *Essay on Liberty*, 204.

people as the Constitution asserts in its opening statement: "We, the people of the United States. . . ." Clearly the legal powers of the people are not granted to them by someone else. Dr. Alexander Meikeljohn says:

All authority originates in us, the people. If someone else has authority, we are lending it to him . . . we must keep clearly in mind the distinction between the people, the authority, and the government which is doing the governing with our permission. Our Bill of Rights, when dealing with the people as governed, gives them protection of their rights 'under the laws.' When dealing with the people as governors, they give them protection of their powers 'over the laws.'

Everyone who is controlled by the government has rights under the Bill of Rights.<sup>13</sup> An important principle of power is pertinent here. It may be in the form of a question: Why does a majority have the right to rule and the minority the duty to obey? The answer is that the majority are obligated to protect the rights of the minority. As long as these rights are respected the people will support the governors in their right to govern. Respect for the rights of the minority is the guarantee of the majority that the minority will not refuse to be governed by them.

From these considerations certain points are clear: in our democracy the people govern, even those who by delegated authority govern them. The people have kept for themselves the fundamental power which they exercise through their voting; therefore, their voting must be free. The people must be free to consider and discuss all matters, free to read whatever they want to read, free to listen to whomever they want to hear, free to assemble and consult freely with groups of their own choosing and to make judgments and choices without interference. All censorship over their thinking or duress over their voting are strictly forbidden. This is the meaning of the First Amendment to the Constitution. It follows that no agency of government has authority to question any citizen about the beliefs that he holds, whether these may be religious or political. It also follows that a citizen cannot be required to take an oath regarding his beliefs or opinions. Neither can he be required to subscribe to any political, economic, or religious creed. Conformity cannot be required of free citizens. Moreover, freedom requires

---

<sup>13</sup>Alexander Meikeljohn, "Teaching of Intellectual Freedom," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, XXXVIII (March, 1952), 10-25.

that a citizen has the right at all times to question or to criticize any act of legislation or judicial decision, or the Constitution itself. He is obligated to support the Constitution and to obey the laws, but he is always free to oppose them, and to advocate and work for, changes that seem to him desirable.

The Constitution clearly places the freedom of the mind, of religion, of speech, and of assembly at the base of all freedoms; thus does it guarantee all citizens access to the truth, without which they cannot be free.

What happens when people are shut off from their access to the truth — from their right to read, to hear, and to discuss with each other the problems they are called upon to solve? Obviously if a people are shut off from their access to truth through the abrogation of their basic freedoms for any considerable period of time, they become ignorant of the facts that are essential for clear thinking and intelligent action; and ignorance, in the long run, is the worst of all forms of slavery. If people are ignorant, how can they be free?

If they are ignorant of the truth, they become subject to propaganda and political demagoguery. If people cannot get the truth for themselves, they are restricted to the information their rulers want them to have, and the opinions that are prepared for them. The first objective of a would-be dictator is to gain control of the means of communication and education so that he can control the formation of opinions.

The tyranny of government is not the only form of tyranny to be avoided. John Stuart Mill says:

The tyranny of the majority is now generally included among the evils against which society requires to be on its guard. Protection, therefore, against the tyranny of the magistrate is not enough: these need protection also against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling: against the tendency of society to impose by other means than civil penalties its own ideas and practices, or rules of conduct on those who desert from them: to fetter the development and if possible prevent the formation of any individuality not in harmony with its ways, and compel all characters to fashion themselves upon a model of its own. There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence; and to find that limit, and maintain it against encroachment, is as indispensable to a good condition of human affairs as protection against political despotism.<sup>14</sup>

The other points of reference include custom, mores, and religion.

---

<sup>14</sup>John Stuart Mill, *op. cit.*

What, then, is the appropriate region of human liberty? Mill says:

It comprises, *first*, the inward domain of consciousness; demanding liberty of conscience in the most comprehensive sense; liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral or theological—the liberty of expressing and publishing opinions is practically inseparable from it. *Secondly*, the principle requires liberty of tastes and pursuits, and *thirdly*, the liberty of combinations among individuals.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>John Stuart Mill, *op. cit.*

## SOUTHERNERS IN THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION: 1849

DONALD E. HARGIS\*

"In some respects, the political history of California for the year 1849 is without parallel in the annals of any nation."<sup>1</sup> Within a year the population had grown from twenty thousand to over one hundred thousand as men, seeking gold, streamed into that unsettled and primitive political community. Spurned by Congress, which refused California a territorial or a state organization, and with a crude combination of military and Mexican governments which did not lend itself to stable law and order, the immigrants quickly discovered that they had left the well-regulated government of the eastern United States behind them when they crossed the Sierra Nevada mountains.

The Mexican local ordinances, many of which were foreign to the American concept of equity, were in Spanish, and some of the local officials were unable to speak English. These laws were loosely administered, and the newcomers soon were enforcing their own brand of rough-and-ready justice. Although peace with Mexico had been proclaimed in July, 1848, the central government was still to all intents a military dictatorship; this was resented and openly opposed by the incoming Americans.

During the summer of 1849, General Riley, the pseudo-civil governor of California, with the tacit backing of President Taylor, decided that a permanent, representative administration should be established. So he arranged for the election of delegates and for a convention to institute either a territorial or a state government. It was a most extraordinary call, as the organization of the territories was in the hands of Congress. But by the third of September the election had been held, and a quorum of the delegates met in the schoolhouse at Monterey.

### I.

Of the forty-eight delegates who participated in the delibera-

---

\*Assistant Professor of Speech, University of California at Los Angeles.

<sup>1</sup>B. Taylor, *Eldorado*, I (New York, 1850), 146.

tions, twenty-one were from the North, fifteen, from the South, five, from foreign countries, and seven were native Californians. They espoused political theories which ranged from liberal Northern abolitionism to rabid Southern conservatism. The delegates who had emigrated from the South to California were regular in attendance and voting, but some were more active than others in the daily routine and particularly in the public speaking. As leaders in the discussion of every major issue, they had a proposal for each disputed point. For instance, forty per cent of the resolutions, motions, and comments were made by Southern delegates, and their speaking covered approximately fifty per cent of the space devoted to it.<sup>2</sup> Every Southerner but one was a member of a committee, and most had several assignments. The important Select Committee for the Constitution had six Southerners out of a membership of twenty. And, finally, the president of the convention was from the South.

Three of the Southerners: Hobson, Hollingsworth, and Walker, while they attended uniformly, voted, and served on committees, did not participate in the daily discussions.<sup>3</sup> Hill, Moore, and Ord entered into the routine debates, but they made no speeches.<sup>4</sup> As regular participants in the day-to-day business, Dent, Hoppe, and Wozencraft each gave a few short talks on selected issues.<sup>5</sup> On the

<sup>2</sup>J. R. Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California* (Washington, D. C., 1850). For this study, it was decided that any contribution of 400 words or more would be considered to be a speech.

<sup>3</sup>It was impossible to secure biographical data on certain of the Southern delegates, as they seem to have passed from obscurity to obscurity by way of the convention. *Joseph Hobson*, a merchant, arrived in California in 1849 from Maryland. *J. McHenry Hollingsworth* was a soldier who came from Maryland to California in 1847. In 1849 he returned to Washington, D. C., as Riley's courier to deliver the constitution to the President. *Joel P. Walker* was one of the famous "mountain-men" of the West. He migrated from Virginia to Missouri, to Oregon, and then in 1841 to California, returning to Oregon in 1843 and back to California in 1848 as a rancher.

<sup>4</sup>*Henry Hill*, a lieutenant in the army, reached California in 1848 from Virginia. *Benjamin F. Moore* emigrated from Florida to Texas and then to California in 1848. He was a noted criminal lawyer and for several terms a state representative before his death in 1866. *Pacificus Ord* came to California in 1849 from Maryland by way of Louisiana. He was a successful lawyer, United States district attorney, and a judge of the California Supreme Court.

<sup>5</sup>*Lewis Dent*, a soldier, moved to California in 1847 from Missouri. He was a practicing lawyer and became a judge of the California Supreme Court. *Jacob D. Hoppe* migrated from Maryland to Missouri and then to California



other hand, Jones, McCarver, Semple, and Steuart spoke often and were busy in the debates.<sup>6</sup> The two most active delegates in the convention, Gwin and Botts, both Southerners, talked on nearly every issue; and each made more remarks than did any other representative.<sup>7</sup> It is generally agreed that Gwin was the most assiduous and influential delegate,<sup>8</sup> while Botts gave the greatest number of speeches, including the longest one. As president, Semple had tremendous power in guiding the deliberations, recognizing speakers, and appointing committees.

## II.

It is impossible within the limits of this study to investigate all of the issues the Southerners debated. Those which will be examined were the most important to the whole convention, were the most controversial, and gave rise to the most speaking. A review of the salient points the Southerners raised on these problems will demonstrate the areas of conflict and agreement among them and,

---

in 1847 as a captain in the army. After the convention he turned to ranching and business. *O. M. Wozencraft* was born in Ohio, but moved to Louisiana where he became more southern than the native Southerners. He settled in California in 1849 as a practicing physician.

<sup>6</sup>*James M. Jones* was born in Kentucky and reared in Louisiana. He landed in California in July, 1849, and was a successful lawyer and a United States district judge before he died in 1851. *Morton M. McCarver* emigrated from Kentucky to Oregon in 1843 and came to California in 1848 as a rancher. *Robert Semple*, printer, dentist, and doctor, traveled to California in 1845 from Kentucky. He published the first newspaper in California at Monterey in 1846. Following the convention, Semple was a land promoter, farmer, and a practicing physician until his death in 1854. *William M. Steuart* left Maryland in 1848 for California where he practiced law and held local offices.

<sup>7</sup>*William M. Gwin*, born in Tennessee, educated as a doctor and a lawyer, was a United States Marshal and a Congressman from Mississippi and a federal political appointee in New Orleans. He came to California in June, 1849, and died in 1885. He was United States Senator from California from 1850 to 1855 and from 1857 to 1861. *Charles Tyler Botts* was born in Virginia, where he was a successful lawyer, farmer, and farm editor. In 1848 he arrived in California as the keeper of naval stores in Monterey. After the convention he practiced law, was a district judge, a newspaper publisher, and state printer. He died in 1884.

<sup>8</sup>J. Royce, *California* (New York, 1892), 262; J.F.H. Claiborne, *Mississippi, as a Province, Territory and State*, I (Jackson, Miss., 1880), 446; G. H. Tinkham, *California Men and Events* (Stockton, Calif., 1915), 83; & H. M. McPherson, *William McKendree Gwin, Expansionist*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (U. of California, 1931), 120 & 122.

to a degree, the relationship of their ideas to those of the entire delegation.

Three issues were determined early in the proceedings. On the question of originating a territorial or a state government, the speaking was confined to procedural matters except for a brief discussion in which Botts, Gwin, McCarver, and Wozencraft argued for the state structure. The vote was overwhelmingly for the state organization.<sup>9</sup> Surprisingly enough, not even the Southerners were aroused to discuss the prohibition on slavery. It was adopted unanimously without debate.<sup>10</sup> There was debate, however, over citizenship and the franchise. Botts, Dent, Gwin, Hoppe, Jones, and Semple acknowledged the right of Congress to dictate citizenship but not the franchise, which latter right, they claimed, belonged to the people of a state regardless of treaties or action by Congress. Too, the Southerners were obdurate in their demand that only white citizens be given the franchise, and this in turn lead to an extended controversy on whether Indians should vote. The final constitutional provision excluded Indians, although the legislature was given the power to lift that ban.<sup>11</sup>

Two relatively unimportant questions were discussed in some detail. The first was "Should the sessions of the legislature be annual or biennial?" Botts and Semple urged annual sessions to enable the legislature to enact a basic code of law and to allow for rapid correction of faulty legislation. They believed that expense should be disregarded at the outset. Gwin declared for biennial sessions in the belief that annual ones would lead to hasty, excessive legislation, would not allow time between sessions to test laws, and would be a financial burden. Eventually, it was decided to hold the sessions annually.<sup>12</sup> The second question was "Should the government under the new constitution be in force immediately upon ratification or only after recognition by Congress?" Botts, Gwin, Jones, and McCarver were of one accord that it should begin to operate as

<sup>9</sup>Browne, 21-23.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 43 & 44. Although there may have been political motives, it appears that the Southerners were aware of the evils of slavery and were genuinely anxious to escape them in California. See: *ibid.*, 332 & 438 and "Memoirs of Hon. William M. Gwin," ed. by W. H. Ellison, *California Historical Society Quarterly*, XIX, 1 (Mar. 1940), 8.

<sup>11</sup>Browne, 64-73; 158.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 77-78.

soon as the constitution was approved by the electorate. Their reasoning was that as long as Congress had taken no action on California, the people of the territory had the right to form their own government and put it into operation at any time they chose. Botts here delivered the "longest" speech of the convention.<sup>13</sup> The view that the new government would begin to function as soon as the constitution was ratified, was affirmed.<sup>14</sup>

The most amusing dispute was over whether the property which a woman held before marriage should be protected from her husband by common law or by constitutional restriction. Botts advocated the common law as it had the authority of historic precedent and as it offered full security to the wife. He rhapsodized the common law as the foundation of freedom and liberty, pleading not to abandon it. His chief argument was that God and nature had made woman weak, to be ruled and shielded by man, and not by constitutional enactment, which provision would degrade the holy, poetic marriage vow. Botts attacked the advocates of women's rights as "mental hermaphrodites" and claimed that the proposal would make Prince Alberts of the men in California. Jones opposed the application of the common law because it was vague and outmoded, because it was not sacred, and because free institutions would not be jeopardized if it were disregarded in this instance. He reasoned that woman was not merely a chattel, the subject of man, and did require protection from him. Jones regarded the marriage ceremony as a civil contract, without poesy, which demanded the surety of law as did any contract. The ultimate decision included the safeguards for women in the constitution.<sup>15</sup>

The Southerners were aroused by the proposed ban on dueling and particularly by the suggested punishment by disenfranchisement. Although all professed to abhor the practice and wished to outlaw it, still Dent said, and others implied, that there were times when a duel was necessary. Gwin and McCarver claimed that disenfranchisement was a just punishment; but Dent, Jones, and Semple thought it much too severe. The opponents of this punishment observed that if risk of life in a duel would not deter the practice, then

---

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 274-284.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 274-287; 382-387; 395-397.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 257-269.

threatened disenfranchisement would not. At that, the prohibition and the penalty became part of the constitution.<sup>16</sup>

Gwin, seconded by Botts, Jones, and Semple, lead the opposition to the scheme to allow the legislature discretionary power to create corporations and to permit the organization of banks of issue and the circulation of paper money. He averred that corporations should be strictly limited and regulated, as discretionary power to create them would lead to abuse. He used his experience with the ruinous effects of irresponsible banking and worthless paper money to illustrate his demand that they be prohibited. Associations of deposit, he felt, should not be allowed, as they would become banks without legal obligation and would issue paper which would circulate as money. In the final provision the power of the legislature to create corporations was strictly circumscribed, banks of issue were forbidden, but associations of deposit were allowed.<sup>17</sup>

Undoubtedly some of the feeling which had been avoided by adopting the slavery prohibition without discussion was released in the dispute over the admission of free Negroes. Hoppe, Jones, Semple, Steuart, and Wozencraft lead by McCarver were all vehemently opposed to the immigration of free Negroes. They eulogized white labor as ascendent in California, where it should continue, without competition, developing a superior civilization. The freed Negro, they said, would enter into rivalry with white labor and degrade it; violence and bloodshed would result. The Southerners wanted protection against slave owners who might bring their slaves to California and free them in return for a period of indentured labor. This anticipated flood of Negroes, they thought, would become a burden on the charity of the state. McCarver and Semple agreed that the free Negro was a greater evil than the slave, and Jones declared that it was constitutional for a state to decide whom to admit. The restriction was finally rejected.<sup>18</sup> As Jones observed, this was not a division between the North and the South, but, rather, between the mines and the towns.<sup>19</sup>

No controversy consumed more time or excited more speaking

---

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, 248-254.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, 110-116; 124-134; 324-327.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, 48; 137-151; 331-337.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, 332 and C. Goodwin, *The Establishment of State Government in California* (New York, 1914), 126-132.

than did that over whether to seek admission with the full boundary of old California, which included what is now Nevada, most of Utah, and parts of Arizona, or to limit the state to the area it has today. Gwin believed that the larger boundary *was* California, as it was recognized in those dimensions by Spain and Mexico and on maps issued by Congress. He argued that there would be less contention in Congress if the larger boundary were proposed and Congress were allowed to reduce it to the Sierra line by compromise with the legislature, if they so desired. Gwin asserted that as it was not necessary for every person who was in a territory to be represented in convention; hence, although the Mormons in Utah were without representation, it was still legitimate to legislate for them. Botts flatly contradicted this assumption and claimed that the advocates of the larger boundary were advancing it in an illegal and unjust attempt to settle the slavery issue in an area which was not a part of California and over which they had no jurisdiction. For this reason, he felt that all of the Southerners and most of the Northerners in Congress would oppose admission with the extended boundary. McCarver, Semple, and Steuart reiterated the latter viewpoint. Jones finally proposed an acceptable compromise solution and refocused attention on the central problem, which boundary would keep the slavery question from entering the Congressional debate on admission. After innumerable ballots on various schemes and a fight which almost disrupted the convention, the present boundary of California was selected.<sup>20</sup> This, again, was not an alignment of North vs. South, as no sectional bias was evident in either the speaking or the voting.<sup>21</sup>

Aside from the major issues, the Southerners spoke on all of the minor ones as well, although their remarks on them were briefer and less frequent. These minor problems included the organization and financing of the convention, the bill of rights, the judiciary, taxation, the use of public lands, the age for state senators, the governor's power to suspend laws and to pardon and commute, the location of the state capitol, the school fund, amending the constitution, the apportionment, financing the new government, and the way to present the constitution to Congress.

---

<sup>20</sup>Browne, 169-195; 420-452.

<sup>21</sup>See, Goodwin, 164-174 for a detailed analysis of the speaking and voting.

## III.

In addressing the convention the Southerners differed in their organization and development of materials and in their style and delivery even more than they did over fundamental concepts. The speeches ranged from simple, terse statements in outline form, to lengthy ones with complex structure, elaborately developed and stylistically refined. These differences related partly to the subject matter, but more apparently to the man, his background and experience.

Dent, Hoppe, and McCarver gave infrequent, brief talks, which had certain features in common. All three developed their ideas with the bare skeleton of the reasoning sketched in with broad strokes. There were no introductions, but summary sentences furnished conclusions. The reasoning was clear, yet support was non-existent, save for McCarver's incidental illustrations. The style was extremely plain; the wording, meaningful; and the sentences, simple and short. Judged by the composition, the delivery was blunt, with a certain didactic directness.

It was difficult to follow the train of thought in two instances. Steuart's deductive reasoning was fragmentary, vague, and unsupported. The opening was ordinarily a deprecatory apology; and the closing, simply a final sentence. Stylistically the discourse was attractive as it had interesting structure and grace of wording. The delivery must have been smooth and flowing, but not particularly energetic. Wozencraft would make a clear forecast of his intentions and then digress, never summing up his ideas. The deductive reasoning was roughed in with a few illustrations, figures of speech, and restatements for support; and the language was reasonably polished. His delivery was basically conversational, with "genial" directness.<sup>22</sup>

The outstanding characteristic of Semple's discourse was its deductive development; the exceptional transitions dovetailed the sections of the argument. At the outset he stated his central idea, and he concluded with a climax sentence. For development and proof there were illustrations, testimony, and figures of speech, as well as comparison and contrast, rhetorical question, and direct plea. The

<sup>22</sup>H. H. Bancroft, *Works*, XXIII, "History of California," VI (San Francisco, 1888), 287.

construction was diversified and the wording, succinct, if blunt. He was a "stirring speaker"<sup>23</sup> who "possessed a certain natural eloquence [and] his brilliant mind and his eloquence were frequently alluded to by those who remembered him."<sup>24</sup> The consensus was that Semple was a successful president, fair and expeditious. Although he did bungle an occasional ruling, still "he presided with tact and dignity, impressing the delegates with his intellectual capacity and honesty of purpose."<sup>25</sup>

Jones delivered the most lucidly organized speeches of the convention. Each began with a review of the debate and a forecast of the argument, building to a final climax which summarized his main points. The reasoning was inductive with linked sentences marshaling the evidence. As proof, aside from the logical argument, there were quotations, illustrations, statistics, figures of speech, definitions, and restatements, and he employed irony and sarcasm tellingly. His style was oral, with a personal trait which made it colloquial without being slovenly. He had a "chaste, earnest, and beautiful style of elocution"<sup>26</sup> and a "gift of apt and engaging expression."<sup>27</sup> In delivery Jones was conversational with no suggestion of the "oratorical." He was "an eloquent, fluent . . . speaker [who was] tactful, ready, and effective in debate."<sup>28</sup>

In over-all reasoning, Gwin could be confusing and repetitious when, as too often happened, he would deviate from his central theme. However, his specific inferences were clearly drawn and demonstrated a sure grasp of fact. The introductions referred to the preceding debate and included a statement of the central idea; a terse summary with an indication of the necessary action formed the conclusion. His extensive use of supporting materials, particularly illustrations, as well as specific instance, statistics, and figures of speech, was the distinctive feature of the composition. He had direct challenge, mocked and ridiculed, and included occasional invective.

<sup>23</sup>R. D. Hunt, *California's Stately Hall of Fame* (Stockton, Calif., 1950), 236.

<sup>24</sup>Z. G. Radcliffe, "Robert Baylor Semple, Pioneer," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, VI, 2 (June, 1927), 134.

<sup>25</sup>Hunt; cf. Royce, 62-63; 264.

<sup>26</sup>P. H. Burnett, *Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer* (New York, 1880), 379.

<sup>27</sup>G. Cosgrave, "James McHall Jones, the Judge That Never Presided," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, XX, 2 (June, 1941), 113.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, 101-107.

The differing sentence construction avoided monotony, and the wording was fundamentally plain. A turn of phrase, as in the epigram, "The Government, in the most economical form, will be expensive enough,"<sup>29</sup> lent interest. It has been said that, "no other man . . . approaches him [Gwin] in impressiveness and skill" in the speaking of the convention.<sup>30</sup> The directness and force in delivery matched his forthrightness of statement and assisted him in communication.<sup>31</sup>

"Botts of Monterey spoke on every subject, and sometimes narrowly escaped being tiresome, though about things of real importance he reasoned forcefully."<sup>32</sup> At best, he began with an incomplete forecast of the argument or an apology; however, there were effective summaries, climax sentences, or appeals to action. The deductive reasoning was clearly drawn, but it was never concise. Figures of speech, statistics, hypothetical illustrations, testimony, and restatement appeared repeatedly as support and the dilemma, the method of residues, and *reductio ad absurdum* were efficacious in the recurring rebuttal. He brought ridicule, contempt, indignation, and bitterness into the direct challenges and, pathetically, begged and entreated to action. His principal traits of style were wordiness, studied diction, excessive embroidery, and ostentation to the point of artificiality. Botts was powerful in delivery, even though a bit pompous. The wording suggests the absence of a modern, conversational quality, although there was vigor and energy. "Fluent and graceful,"<sup>33</sup> he had "great powers of debate."<sup>34</sup>

#### IV.

It has been charged that the convention was a struggle between the South and the North and that the leaders among the Southerners sought to dominate it.<sup>35</sup> An examination of the proceedings fails

<sup>29</sup>Browne, 77.

<sup>30</sup>Royce.

<sup>31</sup>See footnote 8.

<sup>32</sup>Z. S. Eldredge, *History of California*, III (New York, 1915), 286.

<sup>33</sup>J. A. B. Scherer, *Thirty-first Star* (New York, 1942), 157.

<sup>34</sup>"Memoirs," 7.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Bancroft, 286-303; Royce, 262-263; F. Tuthill, *The History of California* (San Francisco, 1866), 268-278; R. D. Hunt, *The Genesis of California's First Constitution* (Baltimore, 1895), 49.



to substantiate the "Southern bloc" theory.<sup>36</sup> The delegates who had come originally from the South were as divided among themselves on the crucial issues as they were from the Northerners. In much of the debate and on all of the recorded votes, except on the organization of a territory or a state and on slavery, there was a split in opinion; no Southern delegate always voted with the majority of the convention, nor yet with the majority of the Southern delegates. It is evident that on occasion they were espousing California's local interests rather than the affairs of the section from which they had emigrated.<sup>37</sup>

Hill, Hobson, Hollingsworth, Moore, Ord, and Walker did not address the convention, and the infrequent contributions by Dent, Hoppe, McCarver, Steuart, and Wozencraft were actually statements rather than speeches. Semple talked about most of the major issues, but what he said lacked force, as it merely reiterated what had already been well stated. He is undoubtedly better remembered as a successful presiding officer rather than as a speaker.

The three most conspicuous Southerners were leaders in all of the aspects of the business of writing a constitution. Jones discriminated by electing to discuss only those issues on which he had special knowledge. While the discourses on the judiciary, taxation, and free Negroes were particularly effectual, two others were among the dozen superior ones in the convention: settling the issue of women's rights and dictating the compromise solution on the boundary. Jones was noteworthy for his lucid organization and for his conversational style and delivery. "With skill in parliamentary practice, a mind alert and penetrating, a pure diction, he [Jones] was easily one of the most prominent and attractive figures of the convention."<sup>38</sup> Once Gwin had determined to debate a question, he led a running fight for it. His was the decisive voice on the issue of corporations and banks and, while unsuccessful, almost determinative on that of the boundary. His strength lay in his ability to expose the heart of an issue, in his use of supporting material, and

---

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Browne; Goodwin, 84; 126-133; 164-174; J. Ellison, "The Struggle for Civil Government in California," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, X, 2 (June, 1931), 152-157; W. Colton, *Three Years in California* (New York, 1850), 374; W. H. Ellison, *A Self-governing Dominion* (Berkeley, Calif., 1950), 35-36.

<sup>37</sup>See footnotes 19; 36.

<sup>38</sup>Cosgrave, 103-104.

in his sincere, direct delivery. Although conspicuous for his speaking, it was as the leader in the day-to-day business, guiding, directing, and not always too unobtrusively suggesting, that Gwin made his greatest contribution.<sup>39</sup> Botts talked interminably, voicing his opinion on everything. While the addresses were influential, his position on women's rights was a lost cause; and his effort on when the government should start, anticlimactic; but on the boundary he did assist Jones to adjust that difficulty. He had exceptionally detailed argument, telling pathos, and forceful, energetic delivery, but is more easily recalled for his wordiness and elaborate style. Despite his long-windedness, Botts, in several instances, established the basic principles on which the delegates made decisions.

The Southerners played an integral and indispensable role in the California Constitutional Convention of 1849. As a leavening agent for the extremists from the North, they were, in turn, assimilated by the influence of their fellow delegates and by their own experience as Californians. They were indefatigable in the daily routine and debates and led in the solution of the pressing problems. Semple must be recognized for his work as president; Gwin, for his all-around leadership; and Botts, Jones, and Gwin, for their pre-eminent speaking. Through their participation, the Southerners assisted in writing a constitution which was more universally acceptable than it otherwise would have been and which did serve California well for thirty years.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>See: Scherer, 160-163 and footnote 8.

<sup>40</sup>See: Goodwin, 229; W. H. Ellison, 46; Bancroft, 303; Taylor, 165.

## INTERPRETING EMOTION IN POETRY

W. M. PARRISH\*

In this paper I wish to develop a suggestion made in my recent essay, "The Concept of Naturalness." I am concerned with the nature of emotional expression in poetry and the oral interpreter's relation to it.

It has long been assumed that poetry is involved with emotion. From Aristotle's catharsis of pity and fear to T. S. Eliot's doctrine of the objective correlative, both poets and critics have held that poetry is distinguished from other writing chiefly by its emotional appeal.

Well known is Wordsworth's statement that poetry originates from emotion recollected in tranquility and becomes a "spontaneous overflow of powerful feeling." Milton characterized poetry as sensuous and passionate. Bliss Perry said that it "begins in excitement, in some body-and-mind experience." Masfield said that enchantment is the main function of poetry, and that it has always to come from the excitement of the poet.

Various recent writers in describing the effect of poetry have said that it causes goose flesh, or shivers down to spine, or a sensation in the pit of the stomach, or that it is a taking off of the top of the head. The modern critics, for all their attempts to redefine poetry, are still generally agreed that it is primarily concerned with emotion. Yvor Winters calls a poem a statement "in which special pains are taken with the expression of feeling." Kenneth Burke says that literature as art "is designed for the express purpose of arousing emotion." Elder Olson supposes that the end of poetry is "certain pleasures, produced through their play upon our emotions." T. S. Eliot defines his objective correlative as a formula for setting off a particular emotion. And if we take rather his statement that "Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion," we still have the assumption that it is concerned with emotion. And Herbert S. Langfeld, the psychologist of aesthetics, says, "All art expresses emotion. That is the function of art; that in the last analysis is the meaning of art, to give pleasure."

---

\*Professor of Speech, University of Illinois. Presented at the National Speech Association Convention in Cincinnati, Ohio, 1952.

In all this consideration of emotion there has been little attention paid to a definition of emotion, or to an examination of just what is communicated from poet to reader, and how. What does it mean to "express" an emotion? We tend to accept naively the notion that a poet, moved by emotion, puts his emotion on paper; that an interpreter reading the poem is moved by the same emotion; and that by reading the poem aloud he communicates it to his hearers, who thus experience the same emotion that moved the poet to write. A little reflection will show that this "bucket brigade" theory of the transference of emotion is too simple and too inexact an explanation of what really happens.

Let us note first that the emotions, as commonly understood, and as commonly defined by psychologists, are sharp, upsetting physiological and psychological disturbances — psycho-somatic, if you like that word. Now it is the experience of the race that such disturbances cannot be expressed in language. As we say, we are speechless with rage, too frightened to talk, dumb with fear, too sad for words. Language is not an effective medium either for expressing emotion or for perceiving the emotions of others. If we try to express them, our words are confused, disordered, and broken; and poetry is utterance that is highly disciplined, orderly, carefully designed. *Thought* may be formulated and expressed in language, but emotion finds expression rather in tears, or action, or gesture. Neither a poet nor anyone else can successfully put his emotions on paper.

What, then, does get onto paper? We should note that besides pure emotions, (rage, fear, shame, love, hate, grief, etc.) we have certain related symptoms or experiences which psychologists call affective states or processes. But the psychologists seem uncertain as to when a state or an experience is affective, or how it is related to emotion. For instance, is the pain you feel from a sore tooth an emotion? Is the pleasant warmth you feel as you lie in the sun an emotion? Or that comfortable fullness around the middle after a hearty meal? Or that kindly attitude toward little children? Or the excitement of expectation before a football game? Are we to classify as emotional our sensations of pain and pleasure, our appetites and their satisfaction, our desires, interests, sentiments, moods, motives, aversions, comforts? or such things as liveliness, vivacity, artistic enjoyment, inspiration? There seems to be no sure

answer. I do not find that psychologists differentiate clearly even between feeling and emotion. All of these types of experience may have an emotional tinge, an "affective tone." And it is some of these that a poet generally gets into his poem, rather than a pure emotion. Perhaps as often as anything else it is his *attitude* toward things that he expresses. I certainly am not competent to distinguish between these various forms of emotion. The best I can do is lump them all together under the terms feeling and emotion.

Second, we should note that it is possible to be moved by another person's emotion without feeling the same emotion that moves him. Our emotional response is not necessarily a sharing of his emotion. For instance, if your child has an earache, you may suffer for him, but you don't suffer from an earache, even an imaginary one. You can feel sympathy and sorrow and pity before you know the cause of his misery. If you come upon a friend who is grieving over the loss of his mother whom you have never known, you may sympathetically grieve with him, but you don't feel what he feels—a sharp sense of personal loss. Your pity and sorrow for these sufferers is not what they feel at all. And if that child is not yours, his expression of pain may move you only to irritation and annoyance. Under certain circumstances your friend's grief may cause you to feel anger, or pleasure, or fear. We say that emotion is contagious, but it is not always so by any means. A child's tantrum does not ordinarily excite in the observer a sympathetic tantrum. It may rouse rather a feeling of grief, or contempt, or humor, or even fear. And surely our responses to the emotions expressed in poetry may vary in similar ways.

Third, it seems indisputable to me that many poems are not expressions of the poet's feelings, and they may not have anything to do with emotion or feeling. Poets often write about things other than their feelings. A poem may be purely descriptive or rational, an expression not of what the poet feels but of what he thinks, or has observed. It may be a representation of some scene, or event, or mood, or experience, designed to reveal its significance or essential meaning. It may be motivated not by an emotion but by an idea, or merely by a pleasing pattern of words. Stephen Spender's description of the making of a poem contains no mention of his feelings, except his feeling of relief when the poem is finished. He begins with an idea, and he develops it and works it into a poem

by acute concentration, by "sweat and toil." Apparently no feeling is involved in the process.

A poem may be a product of the poet's imagining, dealing with things he has never experienced, as is Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. Poets are not always writing about their own feelings. In many of our best poems the poet does not appear at all, and though he *may* have been prompted by some emotion he makes no mention of it. His own feelings are not the subject of his poem. This is true, for instance, of Shelley's *Ozymandias* and Markham's *The Man with the Hoe*. And if he does express an emotion, it may not be his own. Many so-called lyric poems are really dramatic. That is, though the poet speaks in the first person, he expresses not his own thoughts and feelings, but those he imagines other people have. "It is not necessary," says Eliseo Vivas, "to assume that the actual emotion that is worked up by the poet into the poem is the actual occasion of the creative act." And T. S. Eliot says, "Emotions which he has never experienced will serve his turn as well as those familiar to him," and, "The emotion of art is impersonal."

Fourth, we should note that when a poem is occasioned by some emotion of the poet, that emotion will be greatly altered in the attempt to express it. We find our emotions changing their form or evaporating when we try to put them on paper. If Keats really felt the heartache and numbness he mentions in his *Ode to a Nightingale*, he must have had his feelings considerably modified as he tried to put them into words that would fit the complicated stanza form he chose for the poem. Louis Untermeyer says, "The poet must separate himself from his emotion in order that he may express it, must view it objectively, must depersonalize it."

Fifth, it seems to me that these considerations indicate that a reader's response to emotional representation in poetry will depend upon whether the emotion is personal or general, and upon the poet's method of representing it. Surely it makes a difference whether the emotion is a personal one caused by a specific immediate experience, or whether it is a communal feeling such as all normal readers will share. Wordsworth, in his sonnet *To Sleep*, expresses the yearning restlessness of a specific attack of insomnia. But he does not give his readers insomnia. He is not expressing an emotion that we are expected to share. Our feeling is rather sympathy for his suffering. Robert Burns's loves for his various Nells, Peggys, Jeans,

Megs, and Marys was doubtless real, but it was personal — not a love that we can share with him. We don't know the girls. Rather we find a sympathetic pleasure in *contemplating* his loves. We may, of course, try to identify ourselves with him and feel what he felt, but not necessarily, and it seems to me we can't quite succeed in this.

Wordsworth's sonnet, *The World Is Too Much With Us*, makes a different demand upon us. It expresses a sentiment that the general reader may be expected to share. And some of the lyrics in Tennyson's *In Memoriam* are public prayers in which all readers are expected to join. And some of Shakespeare's sonnets express a communal, not a personal, emotion.

Quite different in their method of appeal, but similar in result, are those poems which, without reference to the author or his emotions, merely present a picture, an incident, a story, an object, in such a way that the reader will be moved in some desired way. Such a poem is Shelley's *Ozymandias*. It is purely descriptive in method, containing no reference to the author's feeling. Of the same nature are Robinson's *Mr. Flood's Party*, and Chesterton's *Lepanto*, and all narrative poetry. In these the reader will probably feel about what the poet felt.

A still different method of appeal is made in that poetry which is dramatic, in which the poet represents some other person as voicing his thoughts and emotions. These are not the poet's emotions at all, and often they are such as neither poet nor reader will wish to experience. Such emotions may arouse quite different emotions in the reader. For instance, the distress and frustration of the poor gentleman in Browning's *Up At a Villa — Down in the City* will move the reader to a kind of tolerant amusement. And the cheap savage malignity of the monk in *Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister* moves us to contempt and disgust, but tinged with amusement, too. Macbeth's murderous rage moves us to horror and fear.

Is it not apparent, then, that a reader is not always expected merely to echo an emotion felt by the poet?

Of course, our concern is with a more difficult and complicated problem than I have so far considered. We are not primarily concerned with a simple author-reader relationship. We are concerned with oral interpretation, and the intrusion of an interpreter between author and receiver is a factor which greatly complicates the problem of emotional transference. It is a problem that is not considered

at all by literary critics, and one which I think we interpreters have not sufficiently considered.

Before we look into it a little let me summarize what I have been trying to point out. First, poets do not always write in a state of emotional agitation, are not always motivated by emotion, do not always express emotion, are not concerned exclusively with emotion, and sometimes are not concerned with it at all. Second, the sharp inner disturbances of pure emotion cannot be expressed in language and put upon paper. What gets onto paper is likely to be merely a suggestion of some affective state, whatever that may mean, some mood, attitude, feeling, disposition, or sentiment. Third, the observing of an emotional manifestation does not often cause the observer to experience the same emotion. Fourth, any feeling the poet had to begin with will be modified and refined in the process of trying to put it into language and fit it into a verse pattern. Fifth, a reader's response to a representation of emotion in poetry will depend upon the kind of emotion and the method by which it is represented. In reading some poems he will feel what the poet felt. In others he will merely feel sympathy for the poet. And in still others he may feel a quite different emotion from the one represented.

I recognize, of course, that a great deal of poetry gives pleasure and arouses feeling because of its form, its rhythm, rime, assonance, word music, etc., and does this regardless of whether it deals with emotion. I am not considering this factor here.

What, then, is the task of the oral interpreter with relation to the expression of emotion? First, we must distinguish between speaking about emotion, or even expressing emotion, and speaking emotionally. Even the dryest and dullest of matter, an algebra lesson for instance, can be presented with liveliness and animation. And one can express emotion without speaking emotionally. One can arouse deep feeling in others without himself feeling any emotion, just as cold print, or a cartoon, can arouse deep feeling. One can express emotion without feeling it. I find it difficult to do, but it can be done. I have been moved by a reader who himself remained unmoved by the feelings he was expressing, who, in presenting a pathetic incident was himself actuated chiefly by delight at his success in arousing the feelings of his audience. I feel sure that many actors do not feel the emotions which they express, and which they arouse in their audience. Certainly few actors are moved by their



own humor, though the hearers may roll in the aisles. So then it seems plain that one may express feeling without arousing it in others, and he may both express and arouse feeling without experiencing it himself.

Now a good interpreter, of course, has control over his feelings. What should he do with them? I urge my students constantly to try to feel the emotions they are trying to express. I criticise them often for not reflecting the mood of the passage they are reading. I urge them also to read even cold didactic prose with animation and vivacity, that is, to read with feeling even when there is no feeling to express. In such a case the feeling is their own, not the author's. Whether this is wise teaching in all cases I do not know. I wish I did. I think we ought to recognize that in a given interpretation the same feeling need not be felt by poet, reader, and hearer. I think that at times both the poet and the interpreter may be cold and yet the hearer will be moved. I think that at times the poet's feeling may be communicated to the hearer by a cold interpreter. And with some poems you may have a very successful interpretation when no one of the three is really moved — with didactic or philosophical poems. All three parties might respond with appropriate and significant mental and imaginative activity, and yet not be moved by any feeling. Perhaps Milton's sonnet on his blindness could be so interpreted; or Hamlet's soliloquy.

But one thing of which I feel certain is that poet, interpreter, and listener often need not, and should not, feel the *same* emotion. If the poem does express emotion, and if the emotion is communal — one that all normal people may be expected to feel — then the chain of feeling may pass unbroken from poet to interpreter to hearer. Such a poem is Wordsworth's sonnet, *The World Is Too Much With Us*. Such also are some purely descriptive poems where the poet's feeling is not mentioned, as in *Ozymandias*, and *The Man With the Hoe*. In such poems, however, it seems to me that the interpreter *might*, without being moved himself, merely present the incidents and images and allow them to have their proper effect.

But what about such personal private expressions as Keats' *When I Have Fears*, or Mrs. Browning's *How Do I Love Thee?* If, as I have said, the silent reader is supposed to be an observer, not a sharer, of such emotions, what should be the attitude of the interpreter? It seems to me that he either may, or may not, assume

the feeling of the poet. He may, if he wishes, put himself on the side of the hearer, and, while speaking the words of the poet, may identify himself with the audience and play the role of a sympathetic observer. Even if he decides to impersonate the poet he will hardly be able to experience the emotion that presumably moved the poet. Like an actor, he can assume an emotion without feeling it, just as we all may assume anger without really being angry, or pretend to be cheerful when we are not.

And in definitely dramatic poetry, that in which the reader is not expected to be moved with the same emotion as the character who is represented as speaking, what is the interpreter's role? Should he reflect the emotion of the characters, or that of the audience? Or should he be emotionally neutral? It seems to me that he may do any one of the three. In reading Browning's *Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister* for instance, it seems to me that an interpreter may reflect the passion of the speaker and at the same time show his contempt and amusement at such a petty display of malignant hatred, and that he may, or may not, have his own feelings deeply affected. Or, in reading Drayton's sonnet, "Since there's no help, come, let us kiss and part," an interpreter may express sympathetically Drayton's emotion — relief, or pretend relief, over his renunciation of love — and at the same time express his amusement, which is presumably what the hearer should feel.

All this, I know, is very confusing and contradictory, and I think the reason is that the facts of poetic experience and communication are confusing and contradictory. We have always tended to make the interpretation of emotion too simple, and have thereby violated the facts. Since the workings of emotion are so various and so difficult to understand, and still more difficult to control, and since emotion, if it is always present, is only one of *various* elements in poetry, it seems to me that we would do better to concentrate our attention on those other elements which are more constant, more definite, and more readily studied: — the formal elements of rhythm and word music, the ideational content, and most important of all, the images and symbols. If our interpreters can grasp these and communicate them to their hearers, emotion in both reader and audience can be trusted to take care of itself.

As Elder Olson says, "Emotion in art results . . . because we actively contemplate" a thing. "Our emotions are determined by

the object of imitation." And D. G. James says that emotion is only "part of a total experience central to which is imaginative prehension," and "The central fact about poetry is that in and through it an imaginative object is conveyed." The primary concern of the interpreter, then, should be, not to feel emotion, or to arouse emotion in his hearers, but to present vividly the objects, incidents, images, and word-forms that are the stuff of which poetry is made.

I think we will do better to think less about feeling, expressing, and arousing emotion, and more about a clear "imaginative prehension" of what the poem says. We might well return to the idea of Horace that the function of poetry is, not to affect our feelings, but to "profit and delight." Or, go farther back to Aristotle's notion that poetry, like the other arts, is imitation of nature, and that it succeeds when the poet, by his penetrating insight into the nature of things — persons, events, objects, scenes, moods, and truths — reveals to us their ideal forms.

## ENGLISH TEACHERS NEED THE SPEECH CHOIR

BESS COOPER HOPKINS\*

Many years of teaching English in both high school and college have taught me the value of speech training for the English teacher. Just as a teacher of composition needs facility with his own pen, so the teacher of literature should be able to make poetry come alive through his skill in oral reading. For this reason, speech courses should be required of all English majors. By such training I do not mean merely courses *about how* to speak. Rather, individual instruction by a teacher alert to personal defects in the pupil's nuances of expression, voice control and phrasing, and all the other facets of training needed for the future teacher's speech development.

Unfortunately, not every English teacher at present in the schools has had this training. Listen to poetry reading hours in the classroom. Listen to high school graduates read, and, more especially, note how poorly most people read the Bible. Since the average small-town and rural school has no specialized speech department, a chance for improvement rests with the average teacher of English.

But what if he knows no speech instruction techniques himself? Experience has taught me that the best solution of this problem is the use of choral reading. Too long and too often, only the talented youngsters are put into school programs and plays, just as only the best athletes are on the ball squads. On the other hand, speech choirs offer speech advantages for all the members of a class.

This fact was pointed up for me in a recent workshop for teachers. At this time I was instructing a class in speech and saw to it that every student appeared on the stage during assembly programs in both a verse choir and a play. The class was delighted. Many had never had such an experience. As one student expressed it: "During school I was never put into a play because I was shy and in no way gifted. This is the first play I was ever in."

I like to think that in the schools of that rural county the youngsters thereafter had an avalanche of dramatic performances and that that class in speech was a real grain of mustard.

For the uninitiated and overburdened teacher, therefore, I spe-

---

\*Assistant Professor of English, Mississippi Southern College.

cifically recommend the speech or verse choir. I have used these choirs rather successfully without having had particular training in the choir technique. I first heard a speech choir in a speech recital in a Mississippi junior college. Later a talented teacher from the speech department of Louisiana State University demonstrated verse choir procedures by drilling the members of the speech section at the Mississippi Education Association Convention. These were the only experiences I had had before directing choirs myself.

I have had general speech training, and I believe other qualifications can help offset lack of speech skills. The director is, of course, the most important member of the group. Techniques are necessary, but more essential are the love of literature and a knowledge of the emotional and logical background of every poem read. The director should be able to analyze a poem without destroying its texture. He should be an able reader himself. It is desirable that he know music; at least he must be able to sense the movement in poetry as in music. Above all, he must possess sincerity and intelligence, plus enthusiasm for the spoken word. He must have a real sensitivity to imaginative language, and taste and discrimination in presenting good literature. These qualifications most English teachers already possess. If you add to them the belief that the speaking choir is a valuable activity, and a personal effort on his part to acquire a better knowledge of speech and voice, any good English teacher can become a director of speech choirs.

Choral speaking is not a new technique, although it has only recently been used frequently in America. Through the years its use has been persistent in other countries. It was conceived probably as early as 500 B.C., when the Greek drama was at its height. In those early days in Greece the reading of poetry aloud was such a favorite pastime that contests were prescribed by law. And, as for solo readings, many of us recall having seen pictures or murals of the great Greek lyric poet Sappho (600 B. C.) reading her poems to a group of friends.

The Greeks used a speaking chorus in the unfolding of the story in the drama. Upon occasion, one speaker stepped out of the cast and spoke his lines; the chorus answered. Then another speaker advanced until a conversation was in progress, and the chorus continued to supplement the story when needed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Celeste Varnell Dodd, *Our Speech* (Austin, 1940), 253.

In Europe bards, minstrels, minnesingers, and troubadours brought song and story to the people. Often the audience, eager for oral expression, came in on the refrain, clapped and beat time to the rhythm of the verse. In China as early as 200 B.C., small groups participated in the oral reading of poetry. Even the Zulus of South Africa have a form of unison speech, in crude but beautiful chants, in which prayer is offered for rain and other blessings.

Since World War I there has been a revival of choral reading, the greatest activity being in England. There the Oxford Festival, created by John Masefield and his wife, is held yearly in the Masefield gardens. The speakers compete in the reciting of poetry and so further their appreciation of its beauty.<sup>2</sup>

The British Verse Speaking Choir Movement developed in Scotland around 1922, when the first "Verse Speaking Choir" was formed by Miss Marjorie Gullan of Glasgow.<sup>3</sup>

The United States usually the most articulate of nations, has been least articulate in choral reading. We are behind the Old World in recognizing the possibilities of this art and adopting it in our speech program.<sup>4</sup>

Today, however, there is much interest in the speech choir in the United States, especially in teachers' colleges and high schools.

As to selections, all poetry for choral reading should have a compelling rhythm, vivid and changing word pictures, a strong age-appeal, and, in the upper grades and college, forcefully contrasted moods. Material should be prepared for presentation. Some speech experts recommend lighting effects, musical backgrounds, and appropriate bodily movements. My own reaction is against their use; I prefer dependence upon vocal tones and the words for the beauty of the production.

Especially in the English class, the selections must be worth the speaking. Fortunately, the class anthologies are rich in beautiful poems. The gallop of Browning, the waltz of Noyes, the rhythm of Vachel Lindsay — the beauty of all these and more are to be had for the reading.

As to techniques, prepare the students for oral interpretation by

---

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, 254 ff.

<sup>3</sup>Marjorie Gullan, *The Speech Choir* (New York, 1937), 3.

<sup>4</sup>Elizabeth E. Keppie, "Choral Speech and Contests in Europe," *Speech in Education Cultural and Scientific*. Compiled by W. Arthur Cable (Boston, 1930), 114.

creating a need to know the techniques and possibilities. This may be done with recordings and by listening to a good speaker invited to the class for the purpose. Before presenting the poem, the speech-group will contemplate and discuss it, so that they will gain its full sense-value, as well as its meter-and-rhythm patterns. Likewise for prose, the director leads the group to decide upon correct phrasing, centralizing and subordinating, and a suitable tempo. Individual understanding is basic to intelligent cooperative understanding.

From study and experience I have found the following ideas and techniques helpful:

1. Unimportant ideas are hurried over; important ideas are said slowly. A change in pace from slow to fast or fast to slow will emphasize the words on which the change takes place. A syllable or sound may be prolonged for emphasis. Most of the emphasis is attained by intonation and stress.
2. Both the pause and the speed of reading come under the head of "vocal tempo." Pause is considered the strongest form of interest. It gives time for awareness of spiritual values and of an approaching climax of mood or idea.
3. Discipline and training are necessary, as are active imagination and clear understanding of the selection.
4. Broadly speaking, all the voices may be classified as high, middle, low. The type of singing voices aids in placing the speakers. The natural voice habits — no special or "made" voice. The natural voice needs range, flexibility, and power if it is to convey subtle moods and meanings.
5. Treat a lyric as a lyric, not as a dramatic piece. The choir member should understand the form of the poem.
6. Do not *almost* sing the words. Think, feel, and speak with sincerity and feeling.
7. Do not form a speech choir with less than ten members. The ideal number is eighteen to twenty. But remember the main purpose of choral speaking is to give everyone in any given class a chance for oral expression in imaginative language.
8. Choir members should not imitate fellow choir-members. They should think, feel, and speak for themselves.
9. Once the student forgets himself he is on the way to giving a good interpretation.

10. From the beginning use: control of tone, good forward voice production, a clear understanding of the differences between meter and the rhythm.
11. Do no home-work on the selection. Keep the choir fun!

Harrison M. Karr, in his excellent book, *Your Speaking Voice*, makes the following suggestions:

1. Pick out somebody in the last row and focus a conversational tone at him.
2. Open the mouth sufficiently.
3. In delivery, use the maxims of relation, communication, animation.
4. Cultivate and cling to a conversational voice quality.
5. Have a record of your voice made in order to detect your own faults. They *can* be overcome.
6. In case of a "lost" voice, rest.
7. A warm, friendly voice comes easiest from a warm, friendly nature.
8. Speak as "one having authority."
9. Avoid undesirable mannerisms and affectations.
10. Do a great deal of reading aloud.
11. Ordinarily poetry is preferable to prose for oral delivery, because the imagery of poetry is more highly concentrated. [But do not forget much prose is poetic and rich in cadences.]<sup>6</sup>

Many advantages come to the speakers in choral work. It contributes to the spiritual development and self-expression of each student by training him to communicate to others intelligently, sensitively, and powerfully, through choral speech, the finest poetical thought in the English language. There are cultural results and definite social and psychological values in the speech choir. It is made up of people who enjoy good poetry, who believe most of it

---

<sup>6</sup>Agnes Evelyn Craig, *The Speech Arts* (New York, 1937), 500.

<sup>7</sup>Harrison M. Karr, *Your Speaking Voice*, "Special Suggestions and Voice Maxims" (Glendale, California, 1938), 253.



was meant to be spoken, and are willing to equip themselves to speak it.<sup>7</sup>

Because the speech choir is a group activity, the shy pupil has a sense of belonging and a consequent loss of awkwardness. Choral speech helps to develop poise; it is an aid to stage presence and a motivating device in declamation. Properly directed, the pupils become enthusiastic about poetry. "Must we have poetry again?" changes to "Let's do this one together."<sup>8</sup>

Other advantageous results include: excellent training in breath control and phrasing; quickening of aural perception; stimulation and development of imagination. More than all else the speech choir gives the same emotional release as does the all-day singing — and is fun!

These advantages may be had by all age-groups. Adults grasp more quickly the idea back of choir work; they are more interested in technicalities and better able to work with vocal harmonies. College students would delight in such choral readings as Walt Whitman's "Come Lovely and Soothing Death," Amy Lowell's "Patterns," and Carl Sandburg's "Chicago."

Junior high youngsters are, as a rule, more imaginative and quicker with suggestions for interpretations. But neither adults nor junior high pupils appreciate seeing a poem grow into life as do the nine or ten-year old children, or even the kindergarteners, as simple as their rhymes are.

As to children, there should be present in any oral expression some sort of life situation. For that reason I shall give here two poems suggested for little children by Miss Grace Walker in her article "Creative Recreations":

Boom, boom, beat the drum,  
Boom, boom, here we come,  
Boom, boom, do not lag.  
Boom, boom, wave the flag.

The following is helpful when children need to go to sleep:

Creep to sleep  
Teeny Sheep.

<sup>7</sup>Gullan, 8.

<sup>8</sup>Joseph R. Casey, "We Speak Together," *National Education Association Journal*, XLI (December, 1952), 572.

Creep to sleep  
 Teeny Sheep.  
 Creep to sleep  
 Teeny Sheep.  
 Sleep, sleep  
 Sleep

My one experience with a junior high school English class led to a choral reading of Hilaire Belloc's "Jim." This amusing poem was in their text. How the youngsters loved it! Best of all, everybody in the class was a part of the venture. As a starting point for the teacher without experience and training, I submit the techniques I employed with a measure of success with "Jim."

"JIM"

—Hilaire Belloc

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Solo 1. (Middle)             | { There was a Boy whose name was Jim;<br>His Friends were very good to him.   |
| High Unison of High          | They gave him Tea, and Cakes, and Jam,  |
| Unison of Low                | And slices of delicious Ham,  |
| Solo 2 (High)                | And Chocolates with Pink inside,  |
| Solo 3 (Low)                 | And little Tricycles to ride,   |
| Unison of Middle             | { And read him stories through and through,<br>And even took him to the Zoo —   |
| Unison of Low<br>(Ominously) | { But there it was the dreadful fate<br>Befell him, which I now relate<br>(Middle) (Solo 1)<br>You know — at least you ought to know,<br>For I have often told you so — |
| (Middle)                     | { That children never are allowed<br>To leave their Nurses in a Crowd;  |
| Unison in<br>High            | { Now this was Jim's especial Foible,<br>He ran away when he was able,<br>And on this inauspicious day<br>He slipped his hand and ran away.                             |
|                              | (Middle) (All — Loud!)<br>He hadn't gone a yard when — Bang.<br>With open Jaws, a Lion sprang,  |
| Solo 2                       | { And hungrily began to eat<br>The Boy, beginning at his feet. (Drag out<br>beginning.)   |

- Unison of Low { Now, just imagine how it feels  
When first your toes and then your heels,  
And then by gradual degrees,  
Your shins and ankles, calves and knees  
Are slowly eaten, bit by bit.
- Solo 1. No wonder Jim detested it! (Solo 2)  
Solo 1 No wonder that he shouted "Hi!"
- Solo 1 { The Honest Keeper heard his cry,  
Though very fat he almost ran  
To help the little gentleman.
- (Solo 3) (Middle)  
"Ponto!" he ordered as he came  
(For Ponto was the Lion's name)  
(Solo 3) (Middle)  
"Ponto!" he cried with angry Frown  
Solo 3 "Let go, Sir! Down, Sir! Put it down!"
- Unison in Low { The Lion made a Sudden *Stop*, } *Stop*  
He let the Dainty Morsel *drop*, } *suddenly*  
And slunk reluctant to his Cage,  
*Snarling* with Disappointed Rage.
- (Drag out  
*Snarling*)
- Unison in Middle { But when he bent him over Jim,  
The Honest Keeper's Eyes were dim.  
The Lion havng reached his Head,
- Solo 3 The Miserable Boy was dead! (Slow on  
(Very bass) *Miserable*)
- Unison in Middle { When Nurse informed his Parents, they  
Were more concerned than I can say:-  
His mother, as she dried her eyes,  
(Solo 2)  
Said: "Well — it gives me no surprise,  
He would not do as he was told!"
- (Light, con-  
versational)
- Unison in Low { His Father, who was self-controlled,  
Bade all the children round attend  
To James's miserable end,
- Everybody (Slow, with  
warning) { And always keep-a hold of Nurse  
For fear of finding something worse.

**Directions:** This poem fits admirably into the techniques of choral reading. It is particularly good for the junior high school level. The important idea is to *feel* the words. Observe the many excellent climatic passages.

My most ambitious experience with a speech choir was a junior-senior presentation given during the war for an all-day patriotic festival at the school.<sup>10</sup> This performance was the focal point of the morning's activities, just as the football game was in the afternoon. The program was a success. But I was even prouder of the choir robes. The home economics teacher and her students ripped up gunny feed sacks the school children had brought from home; dyed the material a soft maroon; and made robes for about forty students. Worn with white shirts, with black bow ties for the boys and windsor ties for the girls, the robes were effective at no cost, save the dye. The whole experience was a fine example of school and community cooperation.

Since all of us need help in reading and interpreting the Bible, I shall conclude this discussion of the English teacher and the speech choir with Psalm XXIV, marked for choral reading:

#### PSALM XXIV

##### Unison

A tremendous idea; take time to give it full significance.	The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; The world, and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, And established it upon the floods.
The question Solo High	{ Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? Or who shall stand in his holy place?

##### Unison

	He that have clean hands, and a pure heart; Who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, Nor sworn deceitfully.
Answer clearly	He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, And righteousness from the God of his Salvation.

<sup>9</sup>Grace Walker, "Creative Recreation," *Recreation*, XLV (1951), 40.

<sup>10</sup>Any reliable publisher of plays can provide suitable speech choirs of the desired length.

	This is the generation of them that seek him, That seek thy face, O Jacob.
Solo Low	Lift up your heads, O ye gates; And be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; And the King of Glory shall come in.
	Unison
	Who is this King of Glory?
Solo Middle	The Lord strong and mighty, The Lord mighty in battle.
	Unison
	Lift up your heads, O ye gates, Even, lift them up, ye everlasting doors; And the King of Glory shall come in.
Trio — Low, High Middle	Who is this King of Glory?
	Unison
	The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory.

For an easy way to guide our students, our churches, and our communities into inspiring oral expression, I give you the speech choir. Its popularity grows with the years. Behind the word and the voice, the heart of youth and adult speaks with that yearning for expression that is eternal.

## MAJOR CIVIL WAR PLAYS, 1882-1899

HERBERT BERGMAN\*

During the eighteen eighties and nineties the play set in the Civil War period was quite popular. Prominent among these plays were Dion Boucicault's *Belle Lamar* (1882), David Belasco's *May Blossom* (1884) and *The Heart of Maryland* (1895), Bronson Howard's *Shenandoah* (1888), William Gillette's *Held by the Enemy* (1886) and *Secret Service* (1895), Clyde Fitch's *Barbara Frietchie* (1899), and James A. Herne's *The Reverend Griffith Davenport* (1899). The common characteristics of these Civil War plays reveal something of the dramatic taste and conventions of the period.

With one exception, *The Reverend Griffith Davenport*, the plays are almost devoid of any serious content. One looks in vain for a more than cursory treatment of slavery, for political convictions or ideas, for economic conditions, or for ethical beliefs.

One finds instead, rather hackneyed plots, embodying the reconciliation theme, lack of sectional bias, romantically melodramatic characters and action, and contrived comic relief.

Except in *Griffith Davenport*, a Southern girl loves a Northern soldier or spy; there is frequently a conflict<sup>1</sup> between love of the South, or duty, and love of the man. In *Belle Lamar*, Stonewall Jackson states the theme: "A woman's country is her husband's home — her cause, his happiness — her only place in the world, his side, and death alone should not part them."<sup>2</sup> And Belle elects to face death with Philip, her former husband: "This wilful, proud, but loving heart has never wandered from you as I have done: never had any cause but one — its faithful love. Let me stay and die — if die you must — by your side" (p. 194). *May Blossom* loves

\*Instructor in English, The University of Texas.

<sup>1</sup>In *Griffith Davenport* there is no such conflict; despite the pleading of his wife, Griffith decides to guide a Confederate corps of engineers through Virginia. In *Secret Service*, the hero must choose and chooses love; in *Held by the Enemy*, the hero once refuses the request of a Southern girl to help her cousin escape and tries to stop his escape; later he helps him to escape. The hero of *The Heart of Maryland* insists on returning to battle even though Maryland says it is the end if he does so.

<sup>2</sup>In *Plays for the College Theatre*, ed. Garrett H. Leverton (New York, 1937), 141.

a Confederate spy, but does not have to make a choice between her country and him. Maryland's heart is "torn by this divided duty. On one side, our country — oppressed, forlorn, desolate. . . . On the other, our very own turned to foes."<sup>3</sup> She chooses her "very own": to save Alan's life she tells him of General Kendrick's plan to surprise Charlesville, thereby causing the forces of the South to be driven back and the plan of invasion of the North to be defeated. To prevent the ringing of a bell which will give the alarm for Alan's escape, she hangs on to its tongue and swings with it. She concludes: "War is not for women — we may feel — reason — and sacrifice like soldiers in our patriotism — but a glimpse of a loved one in peril — and we are women again — straight our hand goes out to save, no matter what the consequence" (p. 246). Howard, in *Shenandoah*, says:

Every woman's heart, the world over, belongs not to any country or any flag, but to her husband — and her lover. Pray for the man you love, sister — it would be treason not to.<sup>4</sup>

To a woman who objected to these words, Howard wrote:

The love of man and woman is above and below patriotism: the object and the cause of patriotic sacrifice. . . . Patriotism is an attendant and protector of this love; and we honor patriotism in the highest possible degree when we place it second to the impulse on which the existence of our race and of our country depends. . . . The two girls in *Shenandoah*, who exchange their allegiance when the men they love are in battle, are simply acting as natural young women.<sup>5</sup>

In *Held By the Enemy*, Gillette writes: "Love has no North or South — or East or West."<sup>6</sup> He illustrates that love is not a matter of geography in *Secret Service*, in which Edith, a loyal Southerner, gives a commission to a known spy, Captain Thorne, to save his life and also tells him that he can save himself by falling on the ground when the squad fires, as the musket balls have been taken out of the guns. Though Barbara Frietchie loves "Maryland and all the South, the blessed, sweet, dear South, — still you, you Northerner — you Yankee! — you, my soldier lover — I love you most!"<sup>7</sup> Defy-

<sup>3</sup>David Belasco, *The Heart of Maryland & Other Plays*, ed. Glenn Hughes and George Savage (Princeton, 1941), 194.

<sup>4</sup>In *Representative American Plays* . . . , 6th ed., ed. Arthur Hobson Quinn (New York, 1938), 503.

<sup>5</sup>Letter of July 3, 1890, in *New York Dramatic Mirror*, July 19, 1890.

<sup>6</sup>(New York, 1925), 32.

<sup>7</sup>*Plays by Clyde Fitch*, ed. Montrose J. Moses and Virginia Gerson (Boston, 1920), II, 62.

ing her father, she is about to marry him; she shoots a Confederate soldier who is aiming at him and, before a crowd of Southerners, fastens the Union flag to a staff on her balcony.

As common as the theme is the playwrights' impartiality: the heroes of the plays are invariably on the Northern side; the heroines are Southern. The Southerners are favorably depicted. In *Belle Lamar*, Marston, a Southern spy, voluntarily confesses rather than seek shelter behind a woman; another Southern spy, Stuart, will give his life rather than inform on his comrades. Steve, a Virginian, in *May Blossom*, is a sympathetic character, tortured constantly because of his perfidy to a Northern spy, who was to marry May, whom Steve loved and married. In *The Heart of Maryland*, General Kendrick and Lieutenant Telfair, both Confederate soldiers, are favorably shown. One of the two heroes of *Shenandoah* (the minor one), Colonel Ellingham, is a Southerner. Confederate Lieutenant Hayne, a spy, refuses to escape by having an innocent man charged with his crime. His speech before the Court, in *Held by the Enemy*, in which the villain is a Northerner, is certainly heroic:

Ah've been fighting for my country — for my home — for those Ah love — for the cause that is dear to me! — For that cause Ah crossed your picket lines . . . For that cause Ah'm ready to give my life! Condemn me to death — for Ah am a spy! It's no disgrace — it's a glory — an' I'm proud of it! (*Stands defiantly before the Court*) Proud of it! Proud of it! (p. 50)

Wilfred Varney, a Southern youth in *Secret Service*, is patriotic and manly. The hero Griffith Davenport is a Virginian. In *Shenandoah*, Howard has a Confederate colonel tell a Union officer: "My dear old comrade, one of us will be wrong in this great fight, but we shall both be honest in it" (p. 480). Gillette, in *Held by the Enemy*, well sums up the playwrights' attitude: "Everything will be forgiven and forgotten — everything but the glorious bravery on both sides!" (p. 32)

Gloriously brave are the heroes of the play; pitch black are the villains; spirited, beautiful, and courageous are the lily-white heroines: these are typically unshaded melodramatic characters. The heightened action is also melodramatic, with improbabilities, and, except for *Barbara Frietchie*, ends happily, with poetic justice being meted out to the villain.

In *Belle Lamar*, the hero Philip attempts to hold a position against overwhelming odds. In a scene contrived for emotion-arous-



ing, he is forced to try his former wife as a spy. General Stonewall Jackson very improbably appears, under a flag of truce, to offer to exchange two field-officers and an intercepted dispatch for a major and Belle. At the end of the play, he personally comes to ask Colonel Bligh to surrender so as "to arrest a useless effusion of blood and waste of life." Bligh has thirty minutes before he will be annihilated. Of course, just in time, General Fremont's troops arrive to rescue him, and Bligh and Belle are happily reconciled.

*May Blossom* is much more of a tear jerker than *Belle Lamar*. May's distress at realizing her father wants her to marry Steve when she loves Richard, Richard's return after she has married Steve, the scene in which Steve tells Mary he is leaving (one scarcely sees why), his departure, and his return six years later are strictly sentimental, theatrical hokum.

*The Heart of Maryland* is a mere theatrical piece too. Belasco obviously manipulated the action so as to bring Colonel Alan Kendrick, suspected of being a Southern spy, face to face with his father, a Northern general, and to make Maryland unwittingly declare Alan a spy. He makes the villain Thorpe a hard drinker who betrays both sides: "I don't care which rag I serve under. I fight for my own hand" (p. 212). Thorpe is such a coarse, low brute that he forces himself on Maryland in the presence of bound Alan: "... tonight is mine! You leave this woman you love in my hands — [with awful meaning] and you know I can take care of women." And Maryland "gives a long, shuddering cry." Thorpe puts his arm about her and tries to kiss her. "As he overcomes her resistance she gives a cry of disgust, horror and rage, and seizing the bayonet from the table, stabs him in the shoulder" (pp. 233-234). Then comes the big scene, in which she hangs to the swinging tongue of the bell. As in all good melodramas, the villain is punished (he is to die) and the lovers are in each other's arms at the curtain.

Perhaps more melodramatic than *The Heart of Maryland* are Gillette's two Civil War plays, both of which are nothing more than a series of thrilling situations, for which the plays were written. "It is my habit, in constructing a drama," Gillette said, "to fix my main situation in mind, and work from it backward and forward. In 'Held by the Enemy' it was the dead body of the Confederate spy on the stretcher in the church. In 'Secret Service' it was the telegraphing

scene."<sup>8</sup> Besides the main situation in *Held by the Enemy*, there are other heightened situations: the struggle between Hayne and Brant, the trial of Hayne, and the foiling of the hard-drinking villain's attempt to marry the heroine. Highly improbable is the means by which live Hayne is passed off as dead and escapes. Likewise, in *Secret Service*, Thorne's being saved from execution at the very last moment is improbable, while Thorne's capture of his own brother, who shoots himself, is quite powerful.

*Barbara Frietchie* also has improbabilities — Trumbull's knowing that it was Arthur Frietchie (whom he has presumably never seen before) that entered the house, a Maryland man's knowing Trumbull's people in Connecticut, a Union officer's telling a woman a Union plan, Arthur Frietchie's being the one to search the house in which his sister is and to shoot her lover in battle, and the two soldiers chosen to remain in a house as sharpshooters being the men who had deserted from the regiment of Barbara's lover. Without these improbabilities, there would not be the highly emotional scenes — Barbara's defiance of Confederate soldiers who start to search the house in which her wounded brother lies, her begging her father to let the Union officer remain, her defiance of Colonel Negley, her keeping Jack from the room where Trumbull lies wounded, and her fastening the Union flag on a balcony.

*Shenandoah* is much less melodramatic than *Barbara Frietchie*. There is a deep-dyed villain, Thornton, who is killed. General Haverhill improbably suspects his wife because of a portrait found in the possession of a young officer, who improbably has the custody of the girl he loves. The son of the General, unknown to him, volunteers for a dangerous mission and is killed. The play of course ends happily: the General and his wife are reconciled, and three pairs of lovers come together.

Although *The Reverend Griffith Davenport*<sup>9</sup> has some tense and affective scenes, it is not a melodrama, for the action is adequately motivated. The scenes in which Sally pleads for Griffith to buy her husband, a negro plunges a knife into his throat, and a mob of

<sup>8</sup>G. C. J., "How Plays are Born." Otherwise unidentified newspaper clipping in New York Public Library Theatre Collection.

<sup>9</sup>Act III is printed in *American Literature*, XXIV (Nov., 1952), 330-351; Act IV, with a synopsis of the missing acts, is in *The Early Plays of James A. Herne*, ed. Arthur Hobson Quinn (Princeton, 1940), 138-160.

men storm a house are heightened, yet not melodramatic. But Griffith's being captured by the Confederates under his own son is rather melodramatic.

*Griffith Davenport* is unique, too, in seriously treating the problems of slavery. The play shows the happy, well-treated slave and the ill-treated slave, the tragedy of the separation of husband and wife, and the status of free slaves. It shows the feelings of the Virginians toward Lincoln and the type of war the Civil War was, "a brutal war," not a war against oppression, but "a factional fight . . . a political war!" (*Early Plays*, p. 157)

Except for a mention of the destruction of war in *Barbara Frietchie* and of the fact that more than sixty men died in a ward in one morning in *Held by the Enemy*, the other plays present the war romantically. Slavery as an institution receives no really serious consideration, though there are incidental references to it. Barbara points out that the Frietchie slaves love them, "and we love them." The Northern captain retorts: "You hold it right to buy and sell human flesh, to take the young child from its mother, the wife from her husband—" (p. 56). In *Belle Lamar*, Honor curses a negro: "You, and the likes of you brought us all to this. You are the living curse that drives us—" (p. 146).

The cursed negro, Uncle Dan, illustrates the faithfulness of a freed slave to his mistress, Belle, whom he follows; he offers to risk and, later, to sacrifice his life for her. Similarly, in *Held by the Enemy*, Rufus, a slave, asks to be shot in place of a Southern lieutenant. When the other Frietchie slaves run off with the Yankees, faithful Mammy Lu remains to help Barbara. The negroes in *May Blossom* and *Secret Service* aid Northern spies. In *The Heart of Maryland*, the negro is used for comedy.

In the same play, as well as in the others, except *Barbara Frietchie*<sup>10</sup> and *Griffith Davenport*, a couple is introduced for inorganic comedy. *Belle Lamar*, begins with jesting between Pat and Remmy an Irish couple; who sing "Why despiseful did I lave the County Clare?" and Lovesick Remmy provides some humor at the beginning

<sup>10</sup>In this play, Fitch uses Sue's heavy cold for humor in a small portion of the third act: "the tip of her nose is extremely red; she constantly snuffles, and 'whenever she isn't speaking, she holds a small, damp wad of a handkerchief pathetically . . . to her nose'" (p. 141). Her pronunciations are funny: "And thad soldier . . . ; is he sdill adgry with Gabdin Drumbull" (p. 143).

of Acts II and III and this humor is patently comic relief, and not organic. In *May Blossom*, Belasco also introduces comic relief at the beginning of each act; he depends on "homey" details<sup>11</sup> and the prolonged courtship of Deborah by bashful "Uncle" Bartlett. Likewise, in *The Heart of Maryland*, in which the comedy impedes the serious action, Acts I and IV begin with comic interchanges between a Southern lieutenant, Telfair, and a Northern girl, Nanny, who at first spurns his advances; in Act IV Belasco uses cards and apple snow for comedy. In *Held by the Enemy*, where the humor is somewhat better integrated with the action, it is a Southern girl, Susan, who is wooed by a Northerner, Beene, a special artist for *Leslie's*. In Act I his sketching Susan's home and in the last act his proposing (compare *Shenandoah*), when he pretends to have lost an arm, provide humor; his badgering Northern officers is humorous too. A proposal is also used for comedy in *Shenandoah*: Jenny Buckthorn has to ask backward Captain Heartsease if he is in love with her (in the last act); in the first act, in a brief scene, Heartsease humorously returns a handkerchief to her. Some of his speeches are unintentionally risible: "I am in an agony of suspense. The sight of that girl always arouses the strongest emotions of my nature" (p. 510). Both Jenny and Heartsease are Northerners. In the same play, a Northern officer, Kerchival, and the Southern girl he loves, Gertrude, have a humorous scene, where she is to be searched and does not want him to read a letter in which the fact that she loves him is noted.<sup>12</sup> Another couple, Caroline and Wilfred, account for the comedy in *Secret Service*. The well-distributed, but quite contrived, comedy stems, within Act I, from Wilfred's jealousy and Caroline's shortening his trousers; at the beginning of Act II, from Caroline and Wilfred's attempt to condense a letter into a telegram; at the start of Act III, from Caroline's trying to send Wilfred a telegram; and, near the beginning of Act IV, from Wilfred's return wounded.

The comedy, then, in all but two of the eight Civil War plays is superimposed upon the serious action and frequently intrudes upon it.

The audiences of 1882 to 1899 must have been delighted with

<sup>11</sup>For sentiment, Belasco employs a real baby and the burial of a bird by four children.

<sup>12</sup>Near the beginning of Act IV, Howard uses an old couple for humor.

the comedy. For they came to see these Civil War plays to be amused. Herne indicated that *Griffith Davenport* failed because the public wanted to be entertained:

. . . in 'Griffith Davenport' the workings of this wonderful human nature are displayed as modified by certain distinct and peculiar social conditions, of intense interest, perhaps, yet requiring to be understood before the resulting emotions, ideals, struggles, sacrifices, and conquests are appreciated and enjoyed . . . . In 'Griffith Davenport,' the conditions are peculiar to a time and place now unfamiliar, and these in themselves so largely affect the psychological development of the characters, that clear grasp of them is essential. This, I fear, is against the present popularity of the play. The average theater-goer comes to a play to be entertained, and is too weary to cooperate in the process. He refuse to think. . . . People who really want to enjoy such a play as 'Griffith Davenport' must bring their brains as well as their pocket-books to the theatre. So, while I have been more than gratified by the congratulations that have poured in on me from genuine critics and lovers of the drama, I hardly look for a popular success for the play in the present state of the public in things theatrical.<sup>13</sup>

But people did not have to bring their brains to the theatre to enjoy *Belle Lamar*, *May Blossom*, *The Heart of Maryland*, *Shenandoah*, *Held by the Enemy*, *Secret Service*, and *Barbara Frietchie*. These romantic plays lack any serious content and present stereotyped characters in a stereotyped love-versus-duty melodramatic plot, with comic relief. While the slave is favorably depicted, there is nothing in the plays to offend even the most rabid Southerner. The popularity of most of these plays reflects the fairly low taste of the 1882-1899 popular theatre audience.

---

<sup>13</sup>Quoted in Marco Tiempo, "Workers at Work. VI—James A. Herne in 'Griffith Davenport,'" *Arena*, XXII (Aug., 1899), 380.

## THE CIVIL WAR FROM THE NEW YORK STAGE

HUBER W. ELLINGSWORTH\*

One of the aspects of American theatre history which seems thus far to have escaped investigation is the impact of the Civil War upon the New York stage during the period 1861-65. This paper attempts to describe the course of the War as interpreted by New York theatre.

The hectic excitement of the winter of 1860-61 suppressed American artistic activity in general, and particularly the theatre. Theatres closed one by one, and by July, 1861, Laura Keene's was the only regular house open in New York, kept in operation by a war tableau.<sup>1</sup> The autumn of the 1861 season saw some revival of dramatic interest, however, and by January, 1862, the theatres were playing to good houses.<sup>2</sup> Theatre attendance was a remarkably good barometer of the success of the Union cause during the succeeding four years. Immediately following victories the theatres were jammed, but in times of suspense before battles or following defeat, they were almost empty.<sup>3</sup>

A highly interesting and far less obvious development in the wartime theatre was the translation of war themes and events into plays, minstrels, burlesques, and pantomimes. Most of these presentations were produced in a remarkably short time and quickly forgotten, with the result that few scripts were printed and still fewer were published.<sup>4</sup> The chief sources of information available are newspaper advertisements, infrequent reviews, and occasional mention in weekly periodicals.

### I. PATRIOTIC SPECTACLE

One of the major divisions of the war-oriented drama seems to have concerned itself with the generation of gross patriotic feeling.

\*Teaching Assistant in Speech, The Florida State University.

<sup>1</sup>George C. D. Odell, *Annals of the American Stage*, 10 vols. (New York, 1931), VII, 313.

<sup>2</sup>Arthur H. Quinn, *A History of the American Drama* (New York, 1936), 3f.

<sup>3</sup>Emerson D. Fite, *Social and Industrial Conditions in The North During The Civil War* (New York, 1910), 263.

<sup>4</sup>Quinn, 5.

The first of these was produced April 29, 1861, at the New Bowery Theatre and was entitled *The Stars and Stripes*. Appropriately enough, proceedings of the show went for the benefit of the families of New York Union volunteers. Independence Day generated at the National Theatre a "grand patriotic drama" entitled *Show Your Colors or The Stars and Stripes. America's Dream or The Rebellion of '61*, described as "timely," opened on July 24 at the Winter Garden and had a few repetitions.<sup>5</sup> In 1862, Independence Day was combined with a mass recruiting drive then in progress, and the New Bowery produced *The Union Boys of 1862* which ran July 2-5.

It is perhaps significant that war dramas during the rest of the conflict were more focalized around plots, factual or fictitious, and less concerned with the patriotically spectacular.

## II. DRAMATIZATION OF EVENTS

A rather surprising number of plays took contemporary developments of the war as their themes. *The Patriot's Dream* was such a vehicle, advertised as "The past, the present and the future, representing the soul-stirring events of the day, with new and appropriate scenery, costumes and property, including the March through Baltimore, attack on the Massachusetts Regiment, Burning of the Gosport Navy Yard, etc., illustrating the heroic patriotism of the North, and the treachery and infamy of the leaders of the rebellion in the South."<sup>6</sup> Not such an ambitious production in scope was *The Patriots at Sumter in '61* which played May 6 through June 8, 1861, at Barnum's. Evidently what it lacked in breadth was compensated for in intensity, because Barnum himself proclaimed, "The enthusiasm with which the glorious stars and stripes are greeted would strike terror to the heart of every traitor, and convince him that the Union must and will be preserved."<sup>7</sup>

The Battle of Boonville was dramatized at the New Bowery on July 1, running about ten days, and "New Union Tableaux" were added.<sup>8</sup>

A patriotic "double feature" appeared at the New Bowery Au-

---

<sup>5</sup>Odell, 320.

<sup>6</sup>*New York Times*, May 19, 1861.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, May 13, 1861.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, July 3, 1861.

gust 19 and ran for a month. It was *Bull Run or the Sacking of Fairfax Courthouse*, sharing the bill with the Eighth Regiment Drum Corps.<sup>9</sup> The play had several revivals.

Military movements were not to monopolize the spotlight after November 2 when *Hatteras Inlet or Our Naval Victories* was presented at the New Bowery.

The next important development to reach the stage was the capture of Fort Donelson, presented at the New Bowery in late February, 1862. Again concerned with recruiting activities, the same theatre immortalized a New York regiment in *Our Own 69th*.

The conscription act of March, 1863, was met with mingled emotions and the domestic disruptions which it was to produce were dramatized in *The Conscript or The Soldier's Bride* which had a week run at the Old Bowery beginning April 20, 1863. The unpopularity of conscription increased as the time approached for it to be placed in effect, and the discontent was manifested in New York in open riots which began July 11, continuing for several days. The Old Bowery, sensing another opportunity, presented *How to Avoid Drafting* on July 28, and this popular comedy enjoyed many repetitions.

Perhaps the most notable thing about these plays was the speed with which they were rushed into production. *The Battle of Bull Run* occurred July 21, 1861, and reached the stage on August 15. Wood's Minstrels burlesqued the fall of Atlanta September 12, ten days after it occurred. The record is held, however, by the dramatization of the capture of Fort Donelson which was presented February 22, six days after it had taken place.

### III. PLAYS BASED ON FICTITIOUS INCIDENTS

The dream was a device occasionally employed as a point of departure in contriving plots unrelated to actual events, as in *The Patriot's Dream*, noted above, and in *Our Union Saved or Marion's Dream* which did a one-night stand at the French Theatre January 16, 1861. The New Bowery seemed to be a center for drama of this type. *The Traitor's Doom or The Fate of Secession* painted a grim picture of Southern defeat May 6-20, 1861. The adventures of

---

<sup>9</sup>Odell, 335.



*The Rifle Brigade* followed March 7-13, 1862. Two other plays appeared near the end of the war with curiously similar titles. *The Unionist's Daughter* was seen on January 15, 1864, and a year later, on January 23, 1865, the same theatre displayed *The Union Prisoner* or *The Patriot's Daughter*.

#### IV. FARCE AND BURLESQUE

It is notable that the earliest war plays were in deadly earnest. Burlesques and comedies based on war situations did not appear for more than a year. First to be presented was *King Cotton or The Exiled Prince*, opening July 21, 1862, at the Winter Garden.<sup>10</sup> Described as a "burlesque extravaganza," it included Jefferson Davis and Ponce de Leon. The *Times* notes that it was "not a very palpable hit."<sup>11</sup> Bryant's minstrels offered a full bill of war burlesque in October, including *Running the Blockade*, *Sacred Contraband*, *Raw Recruits*, and *Black Brigade*. A year later the same company commented on the progress of the war as seen by a famous dramatic character in *Happy Uncle Tom*.

In September, 1864, Wood's minstrels offered *The Fall of Atlanta* and *Contraband's College*.

In addition to *How to Avoid Drafting* another legitimate comedy made its appearance. It was *The Recruiting Office* done December 28, 1863, at the American Theatre.

#### V. TABLEAUX AND PANORAMA

The ingenuity of theatre producers in the '60's led them beyond what today might be considered legitimate theatre. For example, *The Seven Sisters*, a play which had nothing to do with the war, ran 82 nights at Laura Keane's theatre. On February 11, 1861, a sketch, called *Uncle Tom's Magic Lantern*, was added to the second act. It contained a series of "Union Pictures, embracing both sides of the question." There were eight tableaux:<sup>12</sup>

1. Columbia at Washington's Tower.
2. The 34 States.

<sup>10</sup>Odell, 395.

<sup>11</sup>*New York Times*, July 28, 1862.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, Jan. 12, 1861.

3. The Ebony Wedge.
4. The Stump of the Liberty Tree.
5. The Slave Market.
6. Calhoun's Dream and Washington's.
7. The Army of Valley Forge.
8. Liberty and Diogenes.
9. Apotheosis of Washington.

The sketch was a splendid boon to business and filled the theatre for 177 additional nights.<sup>13</sup>

The most successful separate pantomime was *The Southern Refugees* or *False and True*. Described as a "magnificent military spectacular pantomime," it had its first run August 10-31, 1861, at the Canterbury Music Hall. It was revived three times, running for five months in the winter of 1861-62 at the Music Hall, appearing at the New Idea in May, 1863, and at the Varities in October of the same year.

In 1864 two panoramas appeared to enlighten the people on the progress of the conflict. *Panorama of the Rebellion* was displayed at Temperance Hall and in 1865 was moved to the Lee Avenue Baptist Church. *Polyrama of the War* had a two-week stand at Union Hall in April, 1864.

#### VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The war-time dramatic presentations of 1861-65 were probably not great theatre. They were hastily prepared to capitalize on the war sentiment of the people of New York. As such, few were published and few probably deserved publication. Just as the war movies of 1943 have little appeal of the dispassionate spectator of 1953, so these plays would now have scant interest for any save the student of theatre or propaganda. It is significant, however, that the stage was employed so extensively for propaganda purposes, not by any federal agency, but by theatre managers and playwrights interested in drawing crowds. Many additional facts need to be discovered concerning war plays of the period. How accurate was the representation of facts in those plays dealing with events in the war? How critical were the successful burlesques and comedies of contemporary figures and of the progress of the war? To what extent was the theatre used successfully as a propaganda device?

<sup>13</sup>Quinn, 5.

## THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND SPEECH CORRECTION

FREEMAN McCONNELL\*

The development of speech correction as a science in and of itself has come about as a growing body of knowledge concerning the use of speech as a form of human behavior has been accumulated. In the earlier stages of the development of speech correction workers in this field tended to concentrate on the use of speech drills and the mechanics of speech production. Experience through the years has demonstrated that, while we cannot ignore the mechanics of speaking, we must accept a broader role and integrate our function with the work that is being done in many other related areas.

Although the concept that the elocutionist and the speech correctionist are identical still persists occasionally, the emergence of speech correction as a science has been well established as we embark upon the second half of the present century. I shall not attempt here to review in detail the ever enlarging scope of the speech correctionist. Witness of the recognition of this relatively new field of human endeavor is exemplified in the ever increasing number of speech clinics and rehabilitation centers established in governmental agencies, hospitals, and school systems.

The rapid growth of speech correction has come about because we have been able to accept the broader view that when we are dealing with speech we are basically concerned with an individual's communicative functioning, which cuts across nearly all aspects of our growth, development, and daily existence. Therefore, as speech correctionists, we find we have a common ground with members of the medical profession, psychologists, educators, social workers, and in fact with every person who deals with an individual in an effort to help him adjust to his environment. The need for us to recognize that communication is a two-way process involving the reception and the production of complex verbal symbols must be ever paramount in our thinking as we work with speech handicapped persons or train others to do so. This may mean that concentration on the precision of the mechanical production of a speech sound is less im-

---

\*Director, Bill Wilkerson Hearing and Speech Center, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine. Presented at National Convention of the Speech Association of America, 1952, Cincinnati, Ohio.

portant than other measures which we may use effectively or other goals which may be obtained in cooperation with other specialists in allied fields.

In considering how the sciences can contribute to our field of speech correction, we should perhaps first consider the role of human speech in this broader framework of communication. Miller,<sup>1</sup> stating that communication occurs when information is passed from one place to another, describes the process for us in somewhat the following manner. In most communication systems the source of the information is a human being whose past experience and present needs and perceptions formulate the information to be passed along to others. The transmitter is the human speech machinery which changes the information into a pattern of sound waves that is carried through the air, the channel linking the information source to its destination. The ears of the listener serve as a receiver operating upon the acoustic waves to convert them into nervous activity at their destination, the central nervous system of the listener. Thus, we have the complete communication system—the source, the transmitter, the channel, the receiver, and the destination. It is when one of these parts of the vocal communication system is damaged or becomes ineffective that the speech correctionist may be needed.

If we consider the person with defective speech or hearing against this framework of reference, we can readily see that the sciences have much to contribute to the training of speech therapists. While the importance of the biological sciences is recognized, it is the purpose of this discussion to consider the physical sciences in this connection. In setting up a curriculum of study for speech therapists it sometimes becomes difficult to hold to the middle course, for while we can see that the biological, the physical, and the social sciences all are importantly related to our field, we must not insist on making every speech therapist also a biologist, a physicist, a psychologist, or a classroom teacher. We must remember that speech correction itself is a specialty which requires arduous training, and if the speech therapist must at the same time specialize in other fields, granted that such specialization would add importantly to the speech correction training program, he cannot complete the courses

---

<sup>1</sup>George Miller, *Language and Communication* (New York, 1951).

deemed necessary in his chosen field of specialization. Thus, we have the problem of training people to work in speech correction with sufficient orientation in related areas to prevent them from limiting their area of endeavor in too narrow a sense.

The physical sciences, of course, do contribute immeasurably to this view of speech correction as it is integrated into the concept of communication and language functioning. A basic course in college physics should serve to enable the speech therapist to understand the physical principles of speech production and sound transmission. While courses in speech science are usually offered to teach the student these principles, the analogous relationships that are pointed out in comparing the speech and hearing mechanisms to physical resonating and sound conduction systems often lack meaning for the student because of too little experience with or study of the physical systems used as a reference for comparison. Thus, we attempt to teach one new concept by relating it analogously to another new concept. This procedure is weak, of course, from a pedagogic standpoint.

We have come to consider psychological statistics a prerequisite to speech correction because it provides a background for extracting the utmost in the way of significant, dependable conclusions from measurement data; by the same token one year of basic college physics would provide a meaningful background for the study of the vocal communication system involving, as it does, the propagation, transmission, and reception of sound pressure patterns which make up speech.

To summarize the role of the physical sciences in the speech correction training program, it might be well to review what might be considered the ideal kind of program in this respect. We must remember that we are not endeavoring to turn out acoustic physicists nor electronic engineers but speech correctionists whose function is to deal clinically with speech and hearing defects. The first two years of college study should include one course in physics which is planned to include basic principles of sound and electro-acoustics. The actual study of speech correction should be preceded by a thorough course in speech science, in which the vocal communication system is studied in detail with respect to physical and physiological principles. With this kind of background the speech therapist should

be adequately prepared to deal intelligently with the physical science aspects of speech correction.

The science background, moreover, should make the services of the science laboratory more meaningful to the speech therapist on the job. Ideally, the science laboratory should function as an integral part of a speech correction program. The scientific study of language requires direct observation of communicating individuals and seeks to relate these observations to the existing body of scientific knowledge. It is the speech clinic which provides some of the most valuable source material for the laboratory. Relating the observations of pathological communicative functioning to what has been learned in the laboratory from the study of normal speech and language growth and development, we are able to adapt our clinical techniques accordingly.

The best speech therapist is the one who is continually alert to the findings of the science laboratory. Modern electronic equipment has brought a new objectivity to our knowledge of speech production and perception. The clinician today utilizes constantly tests which have been developed in the laboratory to evaluate and assess with a greater degree of accuracy problems involving the vocal communication system. Clinical work with the deaf and hard of hearing, for example, has been immeasurably benefited in recent years by use of high fidelity precision electronic equipment.

Too often in the past this equipment has been placed in the hands of workers who have had no training in its use nor any real knowledge of its function. This situation can best be remedied by seeing that every speech correctionist has been oriented in the physical sciences adequately to make judicious use of such equipment in the clinic and to interpret the findings of the science laboratory in the light of their applicability to speech correction.

## A PHILOSOPHY OF DISCUSSION: 1954

ROBERT L. SCOTT\*

"The art of discussion, like other arts, must be described, analyzed, and reduced to method if it is to be practiced with understanding and profit."<sup>1</sup> Most teachers of speech would agree; but today a narrow view of discussion coupled with an over-methodized approach to it has hindered progress toward full understanding of and profit from the art. We need to re-examine our approach to this vital democratic process.

The title of this paper, which signifies the approach I believe should be taken towards discussion, was chosen with Emerson's advice in mind: "Speak what you think now in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words. . . ."<sup>2</sup> One should not be misled by Emerson's "hard words." This does not indicate necessarily an antagonistic attitude at all. The passage does indicate that one should not only be willing to speak one's mind but also be willing to change it. These are the two most important factors in implementing discussion; they are also factors which are often lacking in discussion based on "modern methods." Too often the discussant trained in modern methods has no opinions or is afraid to speak what opinions he may have. Again in Emerson's words, "He dismisses without notice his own thought, because it is his."<sup>3</sup> With no verbalized opinions he is in no position to change his mind no matter how enthusiastically he might *agree*. The untrained discussant, on the other hand, is often eager to advance anything that even faintly resembles a formulated opinion. He is, however, usually much too reluctant to revise his opinions. The problem which must be solved in order to practice discussion with understanding and profit is to combine the stimulation and contribution of frankly and clearly stated opinions with the objectivity which places the quest for a sound conclusion above any inclination to hold these private opinions against any and all. Without this second factor,

\*Director of Debate, University of Houston.

<sup>1</sup>Russell H. Wagner and Carroll C. Arnold, *Handbook of Group Discussion* (Boston, 1950), iii.

<sup>2</sup>Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Self Reliance," *Essays* (Garden City, New York, 1941), 19.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, 15.

discussion, which deserves the name, is not possible; without the first, it is usually little more than empty form.

### I. A DESCRIPTION OF DISCUSSION.

A congressional committee, a university class, businessmen over a cup of coffee, or housewives over the back fence — all of these may be discussion groups; and then again, they may not be. If a group in which two or more persons speak aloud at some time or another may or may not be engaging in discussion, the question arises, what is discussion? Following the example of George Bernard Shaw,<sup>4</sup> I prefer, in this case at least, to describe rather than to define. I know of no completely satisfactory definition of discussion. Most definitions are too rigid to fit this dynamic process; others are so general that they do little to clarify the term.

Discussion involves two or more people speaking in a face to face situation, or in a situation in which some modern device, the telephone, radio, or television, brings them "face to face" in essence if not in fact. Most definers or describers attach the word "informal" to the process, which means that although the discussants may be dressed in white ties and tails, they do not deliver "set speeches." Discussion chairmen have been known to set limits on the time that may be taken in making one contribution and even in setting a speaking order to allow everyone to participate. Informality should imply that everyone has a right and an opportunity to express himself openly to the point as it arises.

When a face to face group talks "informally," we have discussion if they rise above mere gossip. In order to discuss, the group must engage in cooperative reflective thinking. John Dewey, the popularizer of the term "reflective thinking," states that the process begins when a problem is met, that is when the thinker(s) cannot proceed by habitual action or by autism. Discussion is a cooperative quest for a conclusion. It is, to use the almost sacred term, problem-solving. The discussants may not be able to define their problem; they may not even recognize it. Still they feel impelled to search for a conclusion and are even quite likely to propose solutions before they can state with any accuracy the problem which

<sup>4</sup>"I do not deal in definitions. . . ." Bernard Shaw, *A Quintessence of Ibsenism* (New York, 1910), 28.



they wish to solve. Quite often discussions begin with unrecognized or partially recognized problems. Sometimes they get beyond this stage; sometimes they do not. They are, nonetheless, searchings for solutions.

Many definers begin by differentiating between discussion and debate or by using their opinions of debate as a jumping off place for their views of discussion. Debate, like discussion, involves people talking. Debate may be formal; that is, it may involve a specified time limit and order for speeches, or it may not. Debate begins with a proposition, with a solution to a problem, which is thereafter either defended or attacked. Some use this fact to differentiate between discussion and debate. But discussion, too, may start with a proposition. A man may walk up to a friend and say, "I believe that we should encourage the Chinese Nationalists to attack the mainland of China." This may be the beginning of either a debate or a discussion. His friend may reply, "I don't." Or he may ask, "Why?" They may argue the original proposition pro and con; or they may arrive, not necessarily immediately, at a problem which they both recognize and then suggest several more solutions which might solve it. One writer<sup>5</sup> has differentiated discussion and debate by labelling the first multilateral (admitting the examination of more than one solution) and the latter unilateral (admitting the examination of only one solution). There is some utility in this differentiation; it indicates, although the writer may not have had this in mind, that the real difference between discussion and debate lies in the attitude of the participants not in the form of the discourse.

The man who walks up to his friend and states a proposition indicates that he is unilaterally oriented toward the particular problem involved; a debate will probably result. A program chairman may plan a discussion and find himself with a debate on his hands. Although the formal arrangements make it much more difficult, I have seen planned debates turn out to be discussions. If the attitude of the participants is so important, we should next turn to an examination of the "discussion attitude."

---

<sup>5</sup>Wayne Thompson, "Discussion and Debate: A Re-Examination," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXX (October, 1944), 298.

## II. THE DISCUSSION ATTITUDE REVISITED.

"The discussion attitude" is a term that has been bandied about a great deal. One college student after several years of indoctrination remarked rather cynically, "The secret of discussion is to get the floor first, then no one can disagree with you." A professor once evaluated a discussion in which he had participated by saying, "Everyone came away feeling good, but that's about all." We have already indicated that the proper attitude toward discussion admits several solutions to be advanced and examined; but the situations which our student and professor experienced must not have reached much concreteness in this aspect. What besides multilaterality does the proper discussion attitude involve?

Discussion is cooperative. Cooperation is an essential aspect of the discussion attitude; but it is this aspect that has most often led us astray. We have not always fully realized what good cooperation in discussion involves, or have at least failed in many cases to communicate our concepts to our students.

The first aspect of cooperation is obvious and easy enough to state. Cooperation means that everyone should be given the opportunity to express his opinion. No one should monopolize the time in speaking or demand that his fellows spend their time following a course which he dictates. On the other hand, although politeness is quite desirable in discussion, cooperation is not merely a matter of "after you dear Alphonse," nor is it agreement for the sake of agreement. On the contrary, cooperation often necessitates disagreement.

If discussion is to be fruitful for the entire group, everyone needs to know where everyone else stands and why. This involves speaking "what you believe now in hard words. . . ." Too often discussion fails to arrive at satisfactory solutions and, quite often, arrives at unsatisfactory ones because the members fail to express their deep-seated beliefs. Sometimes speaking what one believes in hard words makes consensus impossible. Is this failure to reach an agreement bad? If there is not real basis for consensus in the group as it is constituted, is it good to pretend that there is? Many times a group seems to reach agreement on the solution of a problem without much difficulty but, when it comes time to act upon the solution, finds that some of the group are reluctant to act or bring

forth strong objections. Of course any objections should have been stated in the discussion. They might have brought the group to realize that there was no basis for agreement, or, since we by no means wish to suggest that compromise is impossible or necessarily bad, the objections might have altered the solution. This observation brings us to another constituent of discussion.

Cooperation in discussion involves a willingness to change one's opinion as well as to state it. It is not impossible to learn and to teach the utility of compromise. Bernard Shaw relates that he once was elected to the executive board of a society which he joined as a young man. In his first committee meeting he found out that he could not have his way about a proposal he made and walked out. Afterward he realized the utter futility of his course of action and states that that was the last committee he ever walked out of. If we are to have good discussion, we must realize that it involves not playing at getting along with others but the necessity of working with them.

We need to work toward that attitude expressed by Montaigne when he wrote, "When any one contradicts me, he raises my attention, not my anger: I advance towards him who controverts, who instructs me; the cause of truth ought to be the common cause of both the one and of the other."<sup>6</sup> Too often, however, as Montaigne puts it, "Instead of extending our arms, we thrust out our claws."<sup>7</sup> The chief device usually recommended to overcome this tendency of individuals to thrust out their claws is to deal with ideas, not with the people stating them. It is not always easy to avoid dealing with individuals. As Bernard Shaw put it, some men seem unable to speak "without losing their tempers, and treating differences from their opinion as personal insults."<sup>8</sup> We should try our utmost to placate such individuals, to re-orient them, and to treat their contributions with strict objectivity. But we should neither refrain from expressing our own views nor have others restrained from expressing theirs.

Most writers stress agreement as a most desirable factor in discussion. The goal of any discussion group should be to work to-

---

<sup>6</sup>"Of the Art of Conference," *The Essays*, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt, trans. Charles Cotton (London, 1892), III, 158.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>8</sup>Bernard Shaw, *Everybody's Political What's What* (London, 1944), 25.

wards agreement, but in recognizing the desirability of agreement we must not fail to realize the contribution which disagreement can make. Harold Lasswell who puts a premium on agreement writes, "According to the panel idea speakers are uncommitted to specific sides, although care is usually taken to see that some dissent exists."<sup>9</sup> Lasswell was speaking specifically of discussion which is presented before an audience. He realized perhaps that an audience is interested in dissent; but, at best, this is only a secondary contribution of disagreement.

Disagreement stimulates the participants. Not long ago I listened to an intercollegiate discussion group. One member of the group insisted on discussing a point on which his opinions were directly opposed to those of every other member of the group. After the discussion, the faculty-critic labelled this person as a "blocker." He undoubtedly was. His role, however, made a very real contribution to the group members. They were forced to examine carefully ideas which they had accepted without a clearly recognized basis. They may not have changed their opinions, but they certainly understood their ideas much better after the discussion. This is an extreme case. The "blocker" was a detriment as well as an asset. Although he carried his disagreement to extremes, he should not have merely assented silently to the majority opinion. Although cooperation demands that a person express his views, the responsibility of cooperation does not end here. There should be balance, not extremes.

The very nature of discussion involves disagreement. If there is none, what is the purpose of discussion? If a group agrees perfectly on the nature of a problem and on its solution, what real end can their discussion serve? Clarification? If one does not understand or does not realize that a problem or some aspect of a problem exists, or if he does not see that a given course of action should be pursued by the group, is he in agreement? Will he not ask that assertions of such facts be supported?

Finally, disagreement is necessary to lead to final agreement on the most solid foundation possible. Stuart Chase recognizes the function of disagreement:

---

<sup>9</sup>Harold D. Lasswell, "The Clarifier of Public Discussion," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXIV (December, 1948), 451.

Often it is better to work out varying interests between people than to clamp the lid on them. Reconciliation can be overdone, as in the case of those who would "unite Heaven and Hell by combining the best features of both." Some students go so far as to say that if a serious conference lacks preliminary disagreement and strong discussion, something is wrong. The best solution may be found by fusing several points of view. The fusing process is bound to include some heat.<sup>10</sup>

It is better to risk too much heat than to fall into that attitude described by Montaigne, when he wrote, "They have not the courage to correct, because they have not the courage to suffer themselves corrected; and speak with dissimulation in the presence of one another."<sup>11</sup>

### III. AN OLD EMPHASIS FOR A NEW.

Aladdin lost his magic lamp when the villain in the story offered new lamps for old. The new lamp looked fine, but it did not open the proper doors. In discussion we have switched an old emphasis for a new one; it is time that we switched back!

Although men have undoubtedly engaged in discussions since the beginnings of human society, we tend to look on the systematization of discussion as a new discipline. We have not, at any rate, been able to trace an extensive history for disciplined discussion. McBurney and Hance note in passing that "What the ancients called *dialectic* was probably the closest approximation of modern discussion."<sup>12</sup> The emphasis in the best extant examples of ancient dialectic, Plato's dialogues, was much different from that generally found in modern texts on discussion. In Plato the emphasis is on the content,<sup>13</sup> so much so, in fact, that we have a great deal of difficulty in determining more than superficially the method of Socratic dialectic.

Whereas Plato stressed content, modern treatment of discussion stress the form or technique of discussion. In one of the earlier books for example, Harrison S. Elliot wrote, "While democracy really involves a philosophy of life and an attitude toward people, it

<sup>10</sup>Stuart Chase, *Roads to Agreement* (New York, 1951), 39-40.

<sup>11</sup>Montaigne, 158.

<sup>12</sup>James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, *The Principles and Methods of Discussion* (New York, 1939), 16.

<sup>13</sup>See Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet (New York, 1943), II, 103.

requires also a technique."<sup>14</sup> Elliot's example in centering attention on technique has been followed ever since. In 1944 after defining discussion as "a technique for group action in study and solving problems," Wayne Thompson wrote, "Center the attention upon the technique rather than the result."<sup>15</sup> Most writers, in keeping with similar philosophies, have made what should be a dynamic process pretty much a matter of static form. They have, for the most part, adopted or adapted John Dewey's five steps of reflective thinking for a guide. Whether or not it is the intent of these authors, most students using their texts follow the pattern religiously. Discussion becomes a kind of ceremony — step three occurs where step three should occur and nowhere else! The attraction of an emphasis on form is obvious. It is definite. It can be taught in a semester's course or even in a few weeks.<sup>16</sup> Too often the discussion outline becomes the group's liturgy; they go through the motions, they may feel that they have "cooperated," but they do little reflective thinking. In too many situations the only problem faced is that of the form; if the discussants are successful in following the rules, they feel that they have accomplished their purpose.

No one, of course, would advocate that we quit teaching the steps of reflective thought in relation to discussion. Although few object to method; there should be objection to two things: teaching, with or without intent, an inflexible method, and centering attention on method, techniques, and form above all else. Unquestionably technique and form should contribute to the matter of the discussion not dominate it.

Although most writers state that the form of discussion should be flexible, modern practice is apt not to reflect these admonitions. Too often leaders funnel the discussion along static lines; this approach does not stimulate and utilize the potentialities of the group. The group must start where it is. Sometimes solutions proposed "too early" will illustrate deficiencies in defining the problem or in setting up criteria. The group can then do a purposive job of examining or re-examining these areas. The originator of the steps of reflective thought has given a good description of their use in practical deliberations. Dewey wrote:

<sup>14</sup>Harrison S. Elliot, *The Processes of Group Thinking* (New York, 1928), 1.

<sup>15</sup>Thompson, 290.

<sup>16</sup>See Milton Dickens, "Discussion in War Industry," *Quarterly Journal of*

The  
fol  
ing  
cha  
mo  
ide  
jud  
ra/  
an  
tim  
may  
wha

The  
lear  
tau  
pro  
tho  
fol  
and

also  
here  
cont  
conc  
obta  
disc  
be p

T  
tainl  
to be  
that  
other  
cussi  
opini  
make  
techn  
sion

Speech  
17

The five phases, terminals, or functions of thought, that we have noted do not follow one another in a set order. On the contrary, each step in genuine thinking does something to perfect the formation of a suggestion and promote its change into a leading idea or directive hypothesis. It does something to promote the location and definition of the problem. Each improvement in the idea leads to new observations that yield new facts or data and help the mind judge more accurately the relevancy of the facts already at hand. The elaboration of the hypothesis does not wait until the problem has been defined and an adequate hypothesis has been arrived at; it may come at any intermediate time. And as we have just seen, a particular overt test need not be final; it may be introductory to new observations and new suggestions, according to what happens in consequence of it.<sup>17</sup>

The steps of reflecting thinking should be studied, analyzed, and learned by everyone interested in discussion. They should be taught and practiced not as steps to be gone through but as useful processes that may contribute to the group thought at any time. Although the overall structure of a profitable session may tend to follow the sequence of the steps, the processes may be involved again and again in the course of the discussion.

If we stress the methods of discussion — not only the form but also the various roles of the participants which need not be examined here — as contributory processes, we can return to the emphasis of content in discussion. Concentration on ideas, on the quest for conclusions, will make the proper discussion attitude more readily obtainable. Concentration on ideas will make the roles that the discussants play and the techniques that they use not something to be practiced but factors which affect the content.

#### CONCLUSION

This philosophy of discussion is incomplete in many ways; it certainly is not exhaustive. I have tried to stress what I believe needs to be emphasized concerning discussion in 1954. We need to realize that the attitude of the participants differentiate discussion from other verbal activities. Realizing this, we need to work for a discussion attitude which will develop a participant who will state his opinions and who is willing to change his mind. We also need to make discussion idea centered rather than method centered. The techniques and form of discussion should contribute to the discussion of ideas not dominate it.

*Speech*, XXXI (April, 1945), 149.

<sup>17</sup>John Dewey, *How We Think* (Boston, 1933), 115.

## BOOK REVIEWS

EDYTH M. RENSHAW, *Editor*

DESIGNED FOR LISTENING. By Seth A. Fessenden. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1951; viii + 93. \$1.75.

This text is apparently designed to meet the needs of students in the communication course at the University of Denver. It attempts to teach both the techniques of listening and the skills of discussion, committee planning, socio-drama, problem-solving, oral reading and public speaking in 93 pages. As such, it falls short of the goal. Only the most general comments are made on each of these skills. Furthermore, the underlying assumption seems to be that one cannot listen well to a speech unless he knows the skills of rhetoric or that he cannot listen well to a poem unless he knows the skills of interpretation. Frequently the student is urged to "listen" to things that should not occupy the attention of an audience. Instead of listening to the ideas of the speaker, the student is urged to see if the speaker showed "proper dignity and poise," and whether "the speaker enunciates his words clearly and accurately?" etc. To train listeners to observe techniques may be sound if one is developing critics. Our concern with listening, however, is to teach students to comprehend *ideas* and to evaluate them. On this score, the book has very little to say.

Too little use is made of the new, experimentally tested techniques of listening. The book has several charts for self-evaluation and instructor evaluation that should be helpful if one accepts the underlying assumption of the work. Perhaps, however, the book meets the special requirements of the situation at Denver of which I am oblivious.

OTIS M. WALTER

*University of Houston*

PROJECT TEXT IN PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Clark S. Carlile. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953; ix + 190. \$2.50.

The project text abounds with assignments; there are some thirty-four separate assignments with an average of four  $8\frac{1}{2}$ " by 11" pages for each. Included is a form page for the student's outline, the instructor's comments and a form for reporting "Interview Sources of Information" and "Printed Sources of Information."

According to the author, each assignment is explained so that "The student knows exactly what is required of any speech. . . ." Some of the directions, however, do leave a bit to be desired. For example, the assignment for the "Pet Peve Speech" has the following heading: "How to Prepare a Speech About a Pet Peve" followed by this illuminating sentence "No particular preparation is required. . . ." Frequently directions tend to be mechanistic: "Avoid 'stomping' your feet. Keep your weight on both feet. Do not . . . throw your hip out," etc. Some of the "types" of speeches are novel: "Pet Peve Speech," "Fear Confession Speech," "Personal Experience Speech," "The Speech to Get Action—Any Kind," etc.



In short, the book is deficient in depth and deficient in analysis. This situation, perhaps, is because of the nature of the book: it is a workbook probably designed to be used in conjunction with a textbook.

OTIS M. WALTER

*University of Houston*

FUNDAMENTALS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953; pp. vii + 493. \$3.50.

NEW TRAINING FOR EFFECTIVE SPEECH. By Robert J. Oliver and Rupert L. Cortright. New York: the Dryden Press, 1951; pp. vii + 563. \$4.50.

EFFECTIVE SPEAKING FOR EVERY OCCASION. By Willard Hayes Yeager. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1951; pp. xv + 407. \$4.50.

These are revisions of tested texts, each one different in its basic approach and each one excellent in its own way. The authors are well-known to all of us in the field of speech for their sound scholarship and effective teaching.

The Bryant and Wallace text now includes well-written sections on Discussion and Parliamentary Procedure, for which Earnest Brandenburg is partially responsible. The whole book has been tightened up, and the chapter entitled "The Basis of Oral Communication" is particularly improved in its applicability to speech. A principal excellence of the book is the section dealing with "The First Speeches"; another is the usable consideration of audience motivation included in the section on "Persuasion." Each chapter includes related exercises and assignments. Good speeches for study are included in the appendix. The binding, however, is not completely covered with buckram, and therefore will not stand up well under the constant carrying of campus use.

The Oliver and Cortright text particularly emphasizes a "Communications" viewpoint. The interesting chapters on "Conversation and Conversational Quality" and "The Role of Listeners" are noteworthy. The notion that speech satisfies three fundamental needs (self-expression, communication and social control) is both revealing and suggestive. Brief advance chapter outlines, exercises and bibliographies are part of each chapter. Those who have used the book in the past will be pleased that this edition has neither the cheap paper and binding of the first printing, nor the garrish cover of the second.

Yeager's text offers general suggestions about the preparation and delivery of speeches in the first three chapters. The remaining chapters discuss, and offer models of each of nine different types of speeches. It is one of the few places where the would-be public speaker can find specific information about the speech of praise and blame, the speech of celebration, *et al.* The book, however, includes no class exercises.

DONALD H. ECROYD

*University of Alabama*

THE STAGE MANAGER'S HANDBOOK. By Bert Gruver. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953; pp. xviii + 202. \$2.50.

The author has set down on these pages what most amateur and educa-

tional theater groups never fathom — the delineation of the chores of the stage manager, and his relationship to the other elements of theatrical production. Most persons assume that the stage manager's duty is during the performance only, and that his rank is relatively that of the director during rehearsals. Not so in the professional theater, the author contends. The stage manager is one of the initial staff members hired by the producer and director, the selection being based on a man's ability as a taskmaster, his thorough knowledge of all phases of the theater, and his facility as a manager in the strict sense of the word.

Among the valuable items to be found in this book are sections on photographing the play, casting the play, union rules regarding the stage, and planning a play for tour. The author's most important contribution to most theater people is the inclusion in this volume of all types of pre-rehearsal, rehearsal, and performance check lists.

Mr. Gruver, a professional stage manager, writes for the professional theater person, but his various lists of information are adaptable to the circumstances of any theater group. His book, undoubtedly reflecting his personality, is extremely methodical and precise.

VERN REYNOLDS

*Southern Methodist University*

**BASIC TRAINING IN SPEECH.** By Lester Thonssen and Howard Gilkinson. Second edition. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1953; pp. xii + 494. \$4.00.

The first edition of this book published in 1947 was well received and this new revision should be equally popular. The point of view and general organization has not been changed, but the material has been brought up to date and some of the chapters have undergone considerable revision. Three specimen speeches have been included: Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Message to the Seventy-seventh Congress," as an example of a deliberative type; a speech by John M. Allen on an "Appropriation for a Fish Hatchery" delivered before the House of Representatives as an example of an entertaining speech; and a classroom speech by John E. Baird on "The Silent Service" exemplifying the informative type. This edition seems to be even more adaptable to classroom use than the first edition. A textbook is like a new model of a car and is improved by being "road tested" in many classrooms.

The book is designed to be used in a "fundamentals" course, but could be used in a course stressing public speaking alone. The first problem treated is that of the adjustment of the individual to the situation. Basic habits and skills are discussed next with noteworthy handling of visible symbols and of vocabulary building. Lastly the construction of the speech itself is developed.

While the book could be used as a text in a terminal course it would be even more valuable to those students who continue with speech work because of the breadth of background it offers.

JOE WETHERBY

*Duke University*

THE ART OF GOOD SPEECH. By James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wraga. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. viii + 584. \$4.50.

The authors, one of whom is Dean of the School of Speech, Northwestern University and the other Director, Basic Course in Speech at the same institution, tell us in the preface that *The Art of Good Speech* "provides a working knowledge of the principles that underlie good speech." The book is divided into three sections: An Introduction to Speech, Principles and Methods, and Types of Speech.

On the whole the field of public speaking is adequately covered. Those teachers whose basic speech course contains a good deal of oral reading will be disappointed because that subject is touched very lightly here. There are some good selections to be read aloud, given as exercise material for such sections as the one on articulation and pronunciation. However, the author's concept of the basic course, as clearly laid out in one chapter of the book, seems to leave out much that is found in many such courses. For example, there is included no copy of either the phonetic or diacritic alphabet.

Scattered through the book are *New Yorker* cartoons, excellent whether particularly relevant or not. The chapters have good introductions, almost always beginning with a story. The book is carefully, often cleverly written, as witness this passage discussing transitions, on page 233: "If the points of the outline do not follow each other logically, easily, and naturally, the speaker finds himself trying to jump or bridge grand canyons between his points. The jump may land him in the canyon, or the bridge may be so long, tortuous, and rickety that the audience cannot or will not attempt it."

My greatest objection, however, concerns the choice of words. On page 5 I found *transcend*, *sentient*, and *facets* in the same sentence. On the same page were *vagaries* and *perspective in depth*. Page 30 held *empirical* and *crass pragmatic formulaton*. On page 31 were *amoral*, *gratuitous*, *esoteric*, *sanctions*, and *abnegations*. I tried these words on some basic speech students and found almost 100 per cent lack of comprehension. Perhaps Northwestern has smarter freshmen.

Altogether it is an interesting book. If \$4.50 isn't too much for a public speaking book, then you might well consider this for your classes.

ELTON ABERNATHY

Southwest Texas State Teachers College

YOUR VOICE AND SPEECH. By Letitia Raubicheck. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953; pp. xvi + 376. \$3.24.

DEVELOPING YOUR SPEAKING VOICE. By Harrison M. Karr. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953; pp. ix + 406. \$5.00.

Miss Raubicheck has revised the high school textbook *Voice and Speech Problems* first published in 1931. She has eliminated the section labelled "Individual Speech Problems," added a chapter on radio and television, and expanded the material on the drama. Part I, "Communicating Through Speech," is for the most part new and valuable.

Believing that the purpose of speech training is "to make you a more effective person in your dealings with other people," the author deals helpfully with activities ranging from telephone conversations to oral reading. The third of

the book devoted to voice training is less satisfying. Miss Raubicheck now acknowledges, with a distant nod, the regional variations of English, and she has abandoned some of the phonetic complexities of her earlier transcriptions, but her treatment of pronunciation will still puzzle many. And it is disconcerting to read that "When the air causes the lungs to press down on the diaphragm, it presses down in turn. . . ."

Those who liked the original volume will be delighted with the revision. All will praise the hundreds of ingenious assignments and exercises.

Although Professor Karr incorporates considerable material from *Your Speaking Voice* (revised edition, 1946) in his new book, it justifiably appears as an original work. In the earlier volume, written for the general reader, he featured the empirical advice of singers and actors. He has now systematized his principles, eliminated much that was repetitious or trivial, adopted a sophisticated treatment of pronunciation, and produced a book for college classes.

The material is orthodox, and in presenting it the author has steered a nice course between misleading simplification and unnecessary technical detail. Nasality and the inspiratory phase of respiration deserved fuller treatment, the notes on regional variations from General American might have been more helpful, and the classification of vocal quality as pectoral, orotund, etc., might have been omitted together with its ingenious defense. But these are idiosyncratic criticisms of a well-planned, clearly-written textbook.

NORMAN W. MATTIS

*University of North Carolina*

INTEGRATIVE SPEECH. By Elwood Murray, Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland. New York: The Dryden Press, 1953; pp. xxx + 618. \$4.75.

This book is intended as a general speech text at any stage beyond the college freshman level, and correlates with Elwood Murray's earlier volume, *The Speech Personality*, which stresses that effective speaking depends upon the speaker's integration. The present volume is centered on training speakers and listeners to become integrated groups, favorable for intercommunication, by improving their evaluations, increasing their degree of predictability, etc., etc.

A steadily increasing number of teachers will be glad to find tenets of general semantics making up a major part of the warp and woof of this volume. They are employed deftly throughout the book to aid readers to more effective listening and speaking in their progress toward greater influence and usefulness to community or larger area.

The book has been carefully prepared — though in unimaginative academic style — and is the outgrowth of four lithographed editions. Each chapter contains helpful exercises, projects, and reading list. The 53 figures (15 of them unnumbered) are striking and graphic. In them, details are omitted, with concentration on fundamentals. But there is no table of figures, and the numbering system may disturb some persons.

Used effectively by a teacher or placed in the hands of open-minded and inquiring students, this book can be a mighty agent in the development both of leaders and followers toward greater service to community, state, region, and nation.

W. ARTHUR CABLE

*The University of Arizona*

## NEWS AND NOTES

CHLOE ARMSTRONG, *Editor*

Dr. Paul L. Soper, Chairman of the Division of Speech, University of Tennessee, and Mr. Paul Pennington of Louisiana Technical Institute, Ruston, Louisiana, have been appointed to serve as representatives on the college and university level of the executive council of the Southern Speech Association.

Miss Freda Kenner from Memphis, Tennessee, and Oran Teague of the Laboratory School of Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, La., have been appointed as representatives from the elementary and secondary level of the executive council of the Southern Speech Association.

\* \* \*

Joseph E. Wright of Vanderbilt University is on leave on a land grant and is in England directing plays and working with the Northampton Repertory Theatre. In his place as visiting professor is Mr. Alex Reeves, executive director of the Theatre.

\* \* \*

Mrs. Gerald McCulloch, formerly Dean of Fine Arts at Baker University, has joined the staff of Vanderbilt University.

Students at the University of Alabama are soon to have their own campus television station. Newly-developed television camera equipment has been ordered for the Department of Radio and Television. Equipment of the future station is so new that it has not yet been released by its manufacturer. Delivery of a recently-developed type of lightweight television camera is expected in January, according to Dr. Kenneth Harwood, head of the Department of Radio, and Television. Initially, signals of the new station are to be limited to the Alabama Union Building. Service to the whole campus should eventually parallel present coverage of student radio station WABP. Signals of the television operation are to be transmitted by coaxial cable to each receiver. As is campus radio station WABP, the new campus television station is to be managed and operated by students. Majors in the Department of Radio and Television will have further use of the equipment as a television training laboratory. Call letters WABP-TV and operation on Channel 3 have been proposed. Experimental telecasting is scheduled to begin as soon as the equipment has been installed.

\* \* \*

The radio division of the Department of Speech and Radio at Baylor University is sponsoring four sustaining radio programs:

- (1) **ASK THE MINISTER** is a 15 minute weekly program carried by fifteen stations each Sunday morning.
- (2) **BAYLOR INTERPRETS THE NEWS** is a 15 minute weekly program over a local radio station.
- (3) **RELIGION IN THE NEWS** is a 15 minute weekly program over a local radio station.

- (4) **LEARNING TO LIVE** is a program sponsored by the Texas Life Insurance Company which will run for thirteen weeks.

The Department also sponsors a campus-wired radio station in which twenty-five students participate. These programs are under the direction of Professor George Stokes.

Baylor University will hold its annual speech institute for high school students and workshops for teachers during the 1954 summer session. The dates have been set for June 7-19. Approximately one hundred students and teachers attended the institute last year. It includes classes and workshops in debate and discussion, interpretation, fundamentals of speech, and radio for high school students, and a workshop for directing the speech program for teachers.

Dr. Lola Walker, Miss Chloe Armstrong, and Professor and Mrs. Glenn R. Capp attended the Texas Speech Convention on the Southern Methodist University campus during the Thanksgiving holidays. Professor Capp appeared on a panel on the teaching of speech.

The Baylor University Student Entertainment and Speaker's Bureau furnished more than fifty programs by January 1. These programs included readings, book reviews, debates and discussions, and speeches before interested organizations.

\* \* \*

Louisiana State University held a workshop for teachers and students of public speaking and debate on Nov. 13.

Dr. C. M. Wise, head of the Department of Speech at L.S.U., returned last June 1 from a year's leave of absence spent as visiting professor at the University of Hawaii at Honolulu. In addition to his teaching he engaged in research in the Hawaiian Pidgin dialect.

On December 4, 1953, the Oxford University debating team, Patrick Mayhew and John Peters, met the Louisiana State University team, Lenore Evans and W. Scott Nobles. Louisiana's junior United States Senator, Russell Long, an alumnus of the university, presided at the debate. In his student days Senator Long was one of a team to debate Oxford.

WLSU, the Louisiana State University radio station, broadcasts a daily program, *School of the Air*, which is directed to all class-rooms in East Baton Rouge Parish and reaches the 7,000 or 8,000 public school children of the area. General policies for the programs are determined by the WLSU staff in consultation with Mrs. L. J. Perkins, Supervisor of Elementary Schools of the parish. Speech education students plan, write, and broadcast the programs. Another feature of the *School of the Air* is a 20-episode documentary drama of the history of Louisiana, commemorating the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase. This is planned, written, and recorded by members of the WLSU Radio Workshop. The tape recordings are distributed to commercial radio stations in various parts of the state.

Miss Frances Merritt has been promoted to the rank of assistant professor of speech. She received her Ph.D. from Louisiana State University last August 7.

Dr. William S. Vanderpool, Jr. accepted a position at Grinnell College. He

went there from Louisiana State University, where he had been teaching public speaking. He received his Ph.D. last August.

Miss Betty Caraway has been appointed director of the West Tennessee Hearing and Speech Center at Jackson, Tennessee. For the past two years she was speech correctionist in Pointe Coupee and West Baton Rouge parishes in Louisiana.

Mr. Richard Walker resigned as assistant in the Speech Clinic at L.S.U. to accept a position teaching speech correction and conducting a clinic at Hardin College, Searcy, Arkansas.

Miss Helena Wong, instructor of speech at the University of Hawaii, is attending L.S.U. this year working toward her Ph.D.

Dr. G. W. Gray, Professor in the Department of Speech, Louisiana State University, accompanied Dr. R. J. Russell, Dean of the Graduate School, in a visit to the M.I.T. Library, the Lamont Undergraduate Library of Harvard, and the Library of the University of Georgia. Dr. Gray is a member of the Operating Committee of Louisiana State University, appointed to consider features for satisfactory construction of an anticipated new library.

Miss Lucille Ruby, Acting Director of WLSU, the radio station of L.S.U., and Instructor in Speech, has been appointed chairman of a committee of the greater New Orleans Television Foundation to study objectives, program resources and costs of a projected educational television network to provide complete state-wide coverage.

On the evening of November 13, 1953, in the Theatre of Louisiana State University, Claude Rains gave a performance of his "Great Words to Great Music." Jack Maxin played piano accompaniment for several of Rains' readings. The program was sponsored by the University Lecturers and Artists Committee.

Dr. C. L. Shaver, Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University, attended the convention of the Southwest Theatre Conference, which was held October 29-31 at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. He presided at the general session Friday morning, when the playwright, Arthur Miller, author of *Death of a Salesman* and other plays, addressed the convention.

Dr. Cordelia Brong, Associate Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at Louisiana State University, attended the convention of the American Speech and Hearing Association, held in New York November 23-25.

The annual convention of the Louisiana Education Association was held in Lafayette November 23-25. The speech division met on the second day in both morning and afternoon sessions. During the first, the business meeting was conducted; Charles Campbell, Speech Correctionist of Iberville Parish Schools, talked on "The Speech Correction Program in Louisiana" and Albert Capuder, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, led a discussion on "Speech Rallies and their Problems." In the afternoon Waldo Wasson, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, led a panel discussion on "My Role in the Speech Correction Program"; Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, led a discussion on the "Problems of Coaching Debate"; and students of Jennings High School gave a drama demonstration under the direction of Mrs. Luke Richard. Officers for the coming year elected at this meeting are Paul Pennington of Louisiana

Polytechnic Institute, president, succeeding Oran Teague of Louisiana State University, and Mrs. L. J. Berry of Abbeville High School, vice-president, succeeding Mr. Pennington. The executive secretary, Miss Edna West, was elected last year for a two year term.

\* \* \*

Otis M. Walter, Chairman of the Department of Speech, University of Houston, has announced the following appointments in the Radio, Television, and Drama Departments:

Miss Lela E. Blout, Acting Chairman of Drama Department; BA, 1942, and MA, 1944, University of Houston  
 Tom Boyd, Technical Director for Drama Department  
 George L. Collins, Art Director, KUHT; BA, MA.  
 Stanley K. Hamilton, Asst. Professor, Drama Dept; BA, MA, University of Iowa; Ph.D., University of Utah, 1951.  
 Dean Johnston, TV Continuity Writer; BA, ML.  
 Robert L. Scott, Instructor in Speech and Director of Debate; AB, 1950, Colorado State College; AM, 1951, University of Nebraska  
 Lester Wolfson, Asst. Professor of English and Speech; AB, 1945, AM, 1946, University of Michigan.

Radio station KUHT of the University of Houston is presenting courses in agriculture, humanities, music appreciation, biology, and art. In addition, non-credit courses and programs are offered for speech interest groups in the community.

A student congress met on the campus November 20 and 21 for a two-day session to study, prepare, and pass legislation.

The University of Houston, will be host to the Interscholastic League meet, region V on April 25, 1954. Winners of this contest will compete in the state finals.

The Drama Department, under the direction of De. Stanley K. Hamilton, presented *The Shrike* Dec. 7 and 16. The spring production will be *Jonah*, directed by Dr. Stanley K. Hamilton, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

\* \* \*

G. Allen Yoemans, Chairman of the Department of Speech at Howard College in Birmingham, Ala., announces that Professor Henry Lindsey joined the Howard College faculty in September as head of the Department of Drama. He came to Howard College from Ouachita College in Arkadelphia, Arkansas. Mr. Yoemans was promoted from assistant professor to associate professor.

Howard College started its first workshop in radio broadcasting this year.

\* \* \*

Mr. Frank L. Faust of the Maico Hearing Center of New Orleans held a workshop on the Testing of Hearing on the Mississippi Southern College campus on Friday and Saturday, January 8 and 9. The workshop, arranged by Mrs. Frances Rush of the Speech Division, was attended by students, nurses, and interested persons in the state.



The Gulf States Speech Festival will be held on the Mississippi Southern College campus on February 5-6. After-dinner speaking, original speaking, interpretative reading extempore speaking, debate, and radio events will be featured. Prof. Mary Louise Gehring is director of the Tournament.

The Experimental Theatre at Mississippi Southern College will feature the following productions:

- Jan. 28.....*Washed Hands* by Dale Lindsey, Laura Ann Wilber,  
Kathleen Wombleoff  
Feb. 2-3-4.....*The Blind Ones*, by Bob Garrison  
*The Long Goodbye*, by Tennessee Williams  
Feb. 9-10-11.....*Hands Across the Sea* by Noel Coward  
*The Old Lady Shows Her Medals*, by James W. Barrie  
Feb. 16-17-18.....*La Reja* by Alvarez Quintero (to be done in Spanish  
with a Latin American cast).  
Feb. 23.....Scenes from Shakespeare (*Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth*, *Tam-  
ing of the Shrew*.)

Dr. Kenneth Christiansen, director of television projects for the Southern Regional Education Board, addressed a group of educators at a meeting held on the Mississippi Southern College campus on Wednesday, December 16. Representatives from the Gulfport City Council, University of Mississippi, Mississippi State College, Mississippi Southern College, the public schools of Hattiesburg, and the County Probation Office of Forrest County.

In December, Mississippi Southern College held two workshops for high school students interested in debate, public speaking, and interpretation. More than 90 persons representing 14 Mississippi high schools attended the event in either Hattiesburg or Jackson. Guest critic was Prof. Norman Attenhofer of Southeastern Louisiana College at Hammond, La. An exhibition debate between Southeastern and Mississippi Southern was a featured event.

\* \* \*

The Seventh University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference will be held April 22-24, 1954; Professor Jonah W. D. Skiles (Ancient Languages) is the Director, and Professors Hobart Ryland (Romance Languages) and Paul K. Whittaker (Germanic Languages) are Associate Directors.

In addition to the general sessions there will be sections for Classical Languages, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Spanish, Latin American Literature, Slavonic Languages, Biblical and Patristic Languages, Comparative Literature, Linguistics, High School Teaching of Classical Languages, High School Teaching of Modern Languages, Teaching of Languages in the Elementary School, Folklore, and International Relations.

The Sixth (1953) Conference drew an attendance of 610 persons from forty states and seven foreign countries. Thirty-four language areas, from Arabic to Vietnamese, were represented by individuals from 264 institutions. Lectures and papers to the number of 234 were offered in linguistic, literary, humane, social, historical, and pedagogical phases of thirty-two language areas.

Those wishing programs or wishing to offer papers (for 1954 or in the future) should write to Professor Jonah W. D. Skiles, Director, Foreign Language Conference.



